THE

HISTORY OF THE JEWS,

FROM THE TIME OF ALEXANDER THE GREAT TO THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM BY TITUS,

A.M. 3595, B.C. 409 TO A.D. 70.

BY

WILLIAM HALE HALE, M.A.

PRECEPTOR OF THE CHARTERHOUSE AND ARCHDEACON OF LONDON.

FOURTH EDITION.

LONDON AND GLASGOW:

RICHARD GRIFFIN AND COMPANY,

PUBLISHERS TO THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW.

1854.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

FROM THE TIME OF ALEXANDER THE GREAT TO THE TIME OF THE MACCABEES.

FROM A. M. 3595 (B. C. 409) TO A. M. 3836 (B. C. 168).

PAGE

Jewish History defective from the time of Nehemiah to the reign of Alexander the Great 1
Causes of this deficiency 1
The Age succeeding that of Nehemiah prosperous (B. C. 409) . . . 2
State of Judæa.—Murder of Joshua by Johanan, the High Priest . . 2
Priesthood of Jaddua 2
Arrival of Alexander the Great in Asia, B. C. 322.—Conduct of the Jews and of the Samaritans.—Alexander's progress to Jerusalem.—His conduct there 3
Alexander's favour to the Jews.—His behaviour to the Samaritans . . 4
Reasons for his desiring the title of the Son of Jupiter 4
Origin of the Samaritan nation, and of the temple at Mount Gerizim . 5
Hostility between the Jews and Samaritans 6
Controversy respecting the date of the Temple at Mount Gerizim . . 6
Results of the division of Alexander's Empire as affecting Judæa . . 8
Jerusalem taken by Ptolemy by stratagem 9
Conduct of Ptolemy to the Jews 10
Egypt frequented by the Jews 11
Seleucus protects the Jews and grants them many privileges . . . 11
Origin of the Septuagint, B. C. 277 12
Persecution of the Jews at Alexandria, B. C. 217, by Ptolemy Philopater . 13
The Jews again become subject to the Princes of Syria 14

CHAPTER II.

REVIEW OF THE STATE OF RELIGION IN JUDÆA FROM THE TIME OF NEHEMIAH TO THE TIME OF THE MACCABEES.

Rise of the Maccabees.—Progress of Religion from the time of Ezra.—Simon the Just.—Jewish accounts of him 16
Change in the Ecclesiastical Government, 292 B. C. 17
Divinity Schools established, and the traditions of the Elders taught to the people.—Rise of the Sadducees.—Effects of School Divinity . . . 18
Rise of Atheistical principles in Judæa.—Heathenish High Priests, 175 B. C. 19
Jason supplants Onias his brother.—Encourages apostacy . . . 19
Inferential proofs of the existence of Infidelity at Jerusalem prior to Jason's priesthood.—Menelaus supplants Jason 20
Onias put to death.—Tyranny of Menelaus 21
Ominous appearances at Jerusalem.—Antiochus takes Jerusalem.—Pollutes the Temple, B. C. 170 22
Attempts to destroy the city.—Persecution of the Jews by Antiochus.—Conduct of the Samaritans, B. C. 170 23
Dreadful state of the Jewish Church 24
Effects of Divine retribution.—Actions of Mattathias.—Maccabees . 25, 26

CHAPTER III.

THE ASAMONEAN PRINCES.

PAGE

From A. M. 3838, B. C. 166, to A. M. 3967, B. C. 37. From the 146th to the 275th year of the Seleucidæ, or of Contracts . . . 27

Origin of the Asamonean power.—Conduct of Mattathias . . . 28
Mattathias dies.—His death-bed address 29

Judas Maccabeus.

Judas Maccabeus succeeds his father, B. C. 166.—His character. . . 30
Warfare and defeat of the Generals of Antiochus sent against him . . 30
Dedicates the Temple anew.—Feast of Dedication.—Prophecy of Daniel fulfilled, B. C. 165.—The Temple fortified.—Bethsurah fortified, B. C. 164 . 31
League against the Jews defeated by the death of Antiochus Epiphanes.—Campaign of Judas against the neighbouring nations.—Simon withdraws the Jews from Galilee to dwell in Judæa.—Disastrous enterprise of Joseph 32
Attack of Lysias upon Judæa.—Defence of Bethsura.—Peace made with Antiochus.—Friendly interference of the Roman Ambassadors.—Judas carries on a border war.—Traces of idolatrous superstition amongst Judas's soldiers 33
He attempts to reduce the fort of Acra, 164 B. C.—War resumed by the King, B. C. 163.—Courage of Eleazar.—Bethsura lost, B. C. 163.—Jerusalem besieged and capitulates, B. C. 163 34
The articles of capitulation violated.—Conduct and end of Menelaus.—Real commencement of the reign of Judas, B. C. 163 35
Alcimus made High Priest.—Onias, thus excluded, retires to Egypt and builds a temple.—Demetrius sends Bacchides to reinstate Alcimus in the priesthood, B. C. 162.—Roman interference in behalf of Judas, 162 B. C.. . . 36
Death of Judas.—Judas incorrectly styled High Priest 37

Jonathan.

The apostate party revives.—Alcimus in power.—Dreadful persecution.—Jonathan chosen leader. 38
John slain by a party of Arabs.—Jonathan and Simon avenge his death.—Bacchides, the governor, repulsed by Jonathan.—Death of Alcimus.—Bacchides retires from Judea.—Plots against Jonathan, 158 B. C. . . 39
Claims of the impostor Alexander Balas upon Syria.—Benefits accruing to Jonathan from these designs.—Jonathan High Priest, B. C 153.—Demetrius strives to outbid Alexander Balas in his offers to Jonathan . . 40
Terms offered by Demetrius to gain Jonathan, B. C. 153.—Jonathan honoured by Ptolemy, B. C. 150.—Demetrius asserts his right to the crown of Syria, B. C. 148.—Alexander acknowledges the services of Jonathan.—Jonathan attempts the reduction of the fort of Acra, B. C. 145 . . 41
Jonathan's prudence and policy.—Ingratitude of Demetrius.—Treaty with the Romans renewed.—Jerusalem and the neighbouring country fortified . 42
Plots of Tryphon against Jonathan.—Tryphon seizes Jonathan by treachery —puts him to death.—Observation on this transaction. . . . 43

Simon.

B. C. 143.—Judæa fortified.—Simon an independent Prince.—Encourages foreign commerce.—Acra surrenders to Simon.—The hill Acra levelled . 44
Public memorial of Simon's Acts, B. C. 141.—Treaty renewed with Rome, B. C. 140.—Treachery of Antiochus Sidetes, B. C. 139.—Murder of Simon 45
Character of Simon 46

John Hyrcanus.

John the son of Simon, surnamed Hyrcanus, succeeds, B. C. 136.—Heroic conduct of the wife of Simon 46

PAGE

War of Antiochus, B. C. 135.—His clemency.—Hyrcanus accompanies Antiochus into Parthia, B. C. 131.—Hyrcanus takes advantage of the death of Antiochus, B. C. 130.—Edomite proselytes, B. C. 129 47
Ambassadors to Rome, B. C. 128.—The impostor, Alexander Sebina, B. C. 126.—Hyrcanus subdues Samaria.—His conduct to the Pharisees . . 48
Death and character of Hyrcanus, B. C. 107.—Observations on the Sabbatical year 49

ARISTOBULUS.

B. C. 106.—Assumes the title of King.—Conquers the Itureans . . 50

ALEXANDER JANNÆUS.

B. C. 105.—Civil dissensions under his government, B. C. 95.—Evil influence of the Pharisees.—Alexander conquers Moab and Gilead . . . 51
The Gileadites succoured by Demetrius Eucerus, king of Damascus, B. C. 89.—His cruelty.—Gives himself to luxury.—Death and funeral, B. C. 78 . 52

QUEEN ALEXANDRA.

B. C. 78.—Hyrcanus made High-priest.—Character of Alexandra, B. C. 69 . 53

HYRCANUS THE SECOND.

B. C. 69.—Short reign of Hyrcanus the Second 54

ARISTOBULUS THE SECOND.

B. C. 69.—Origin of Antipater, father of Herod the Great . . . 54
Intrigues of Antipater.—Aretas besieges Jerusalem, B. C. 65.—Pompey comes to Damascus, B. C. 63.—Aristobulus and Hyrcanus appeal to him . . 55
Policy of Pompey.—Aretas conquered.—Pompey besieges Jerusalem . . 56
Pompey captures Jerusalem.—Profanes the Temple.—Hyrcanus made High Priest 57

HYRCANUS THE SECOND RESTORED.

B. C. 63.—Alexander escapes.—Tries to recover Jerusalem, B. C. 57 . . 57
Policy of Gabinius.—Establishes five independent Sanhedrims.—Antipater persuades the Jews to assist the Romans, B. C. 56.—Crassus plunders the Temple, B. C. 54 58
Cæsar assisted in Egypt by Antipater, B. C. 48.—Cæsar requites Antipater for his assistance, B. C. 47.—Antipater's family 59
Herod accused by the Sanhedrim.—The Jews protected by Cæsar, B. C. 44.—Assassination of Cæsar.—Syria seized by Cassius 60
Treachery of Malichus.—Death of Antipater.—Jealousy against the sons of Antipater.—Herod espouses Mariamne, B. C. 41 61

ANTIGONUS.

B. C. 40.—Hyrcanus dethroned.—Herod made King. Assisted by the Romans 62
Herod takes Jerusalem, B. C. 37.—Execution of Antigonus.—End of the Asamonean dynasty.—Interpretation of the prophecy of Micah . . . 63

CHAPTER IV.

HEROD THE GREAT.

FROM A. M. 4668, B. C. 46, TO A. M. 4711, B. C. 3.

Accession of Herod to the throne of Judæa, B. C. 41 66
Herod consummates his marriage with Mariamne.—First acts of his reign . 67

PAGE
Antigonus put to death by Antony.—Hyrcanus returns to Judæa, and is put to death by Herod 68
Murder of Aristobulus.—Secret instructions to Joseph.—His execution . 69
Herod's interview with Augustus.—Profuse supplies to him, B. C. 30 . 70
Intrigues of Salome against Mariamne 71
Execution of Mariamne, B. C. 29.—Remorse of Herod.—Execution of Alexandra 72
Herod introduces heathen customs, B. C. 26.—Public games at Jerusalem.—Plot for the assassination of Herod.—Precautions for his personal safety.—Magnificent public works 73
Rebuilding of the Temple, B. C. 25 75
Famine in Judæa, B. C. 25.—Herod's exertions to relieve it.—Joint expedition of Herod and Agrippa, B. C. 14 76
The sons of Herod.—Salome conspires against them.—Rise of Antipater . 77
Trial of Alexander and Aristobulus.—Their execution 78
Conspiracy of Antipater, B. C. 9.—His trial 79
Sickness of Herod.—Execution of Antipater.—Herod's death and character . 80

CHAPTER V.

HISTORY OF THE JEWS FROM THE DEATH OF HEROD THE GREAT TO THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM.

FROM B. C. 3 TO A. D. 79.

Massacre in the Temple.—Archelaus visits Rome 82
Archelaus appointed Ethnarch.—Abuses of the Procurator Sabinus . . 83
Tumults in Jerusalem and the rest of Judæa.—Varus rescues the Roman legion 84
Banishment of Archelaus, A. D. 3.—Reign of Philip, tetrarch of Trachonitis, and of Herod Antipas.—Murder of John the Baptist 85
Agrippa.—Death of Herod Antipas. Taxing of Cyrenius.—Judas Gaulonites 86
Rise of Christianity.—Banishment of the Jews from Rome, A. D. 19 . . 87
Pontius Pilate, A. D. 26.—His despotism and death, A. D. 37 . . . 88
Mildness of Vitellius.—Contention between Jews and Greeks.—Persecution of the Jews at Alexandria.—Philo-Judæus.—Statue of Caligula . . 89
Early History of Agrippa 90
Agrippa invested with the title of King.—His popularity. . . . 91
Agrippa's death, A. D. 41.—His children.—Fadus Procurator . . . 92
Tiberius Alexander Procurator.—Theudas.—Cumanus Procurator, A. D. 48.—Massacre.—Banishment of Cumanus, A. D. 52.—Felix Procurator, A. D. 52 93
Miseries of Judæa.—Festus Procurator, A. D. 60. 94
Albinus Procurator, A. D. 62 94
Abuses of Ananias.—Florus Procurator.—His oppressions . . . 95
Jewish tumults at Cæsarea.—Severities of Florus at Jerusalem. . . 96
Conciliatory Measures of Agrippa.—Agrippa quits Jerusalem.—Rise of Eleazar and Manahem.—Massacre at Cæsarea 97
Massacre at Alexandria.—Advance of Cestius.—Retreat to Antipatris, A. D. 66.—Jewish preparations for war 98
Appointment of Vespasian.—Josephus taken prisoner.—John of Giscala . 99
Murder of the Nobles.—Simon, son of Gioras.—Vespasian proclaimed . 100
Three factions in Jerusalem.—Titus commences the siege, A. D. 70 . . 101
Fortifications of Jerusalem.—The two outward walls captured . . . 102
Mission of Josephus.—Famine.—Crucifixion of Deserters. . . . 103
Titus draws a line of circumvallation round the city 104
Castle of Antonia taken.—The Temple set on fire and destroyed . . 105
Prodigies related by Josephus.—Defence of the Upper City . . . 106
Jerusalem stormed and captured 107
Final destruction of Jerusalem 108

HISTORY OF THE JEWS.

CHAPTER I.

FROM THE TIME OF ALEXANDER THE GREAT TO THE TIME OF THE MACCABEES.

FROM A. M. 3595, B. C. 409, TO A. M. 3836, B. C. 168.

A. M. 3595. B. C. 409.

Jewish History defective.

WITH the books of Ezra and Nehemiah terminates the connected chain of history transmitted to us in the sacred volume of inspiration. A chasm in the records of the Jewish nation then occurs, which Josephus has neglected to fill up, and which it has defied the industrious researches of later writers to supply; hence the lover of history and of antiquity, not less than the practical legislator, has to lament the entire absence of all information, respecting the state and condition of the Jewish nation from the time of Nehemiah to the reign of Alexander the Great. It is not difficult to account for this circumstance, if we consider the limited nature of the historian's labours in the early progress of this most interesting branch of literature. At those periods in the existence of nations, when the wants of people are confined to the supply of the necessaries of life, and the inhabitants, thinly scattered over an extended territory, are protected by the general absence of wealth and luxury from those feelings of ambition, which are in most cases the causes of great political changes, year after year succeeds in the annals of the people without any distinguishing features of public good or natural ill, excepting those produced by the variation of climate, or the unfavourable influence of the seasons, upon the productions of the earth. If the nation be unprovided with laws adapted for the preservation of civil happiness and the repression of civil injury, the promulgation of some useful system of law not unfrequently forms an epocha in the history, sufficiently remarkable to be publicly recorded. The introduction of some novel mode of worshipping the Divinity, is also an event of such importance, as to call for a memorial of the period at which it took place. But when neither of these causes have existed, as in the case of the Jewish nation; when private happiness is secured by a regular code of law like that of Moses, when the form of public worship is such as to admit no change, when peace reigns at home, and no foreign enemy disturbs the labours of the husbandman or the regular administration of justice, the duties of the historian almost cease. His task is rather

Causes of this defect.

B. C. 409. to describe the miseries which men inflict upon each other, than to record the blessings which a gracious Providence pours forth upon the world. We need not, therefore, be surprised at the silence of Josephus, respecting the transactions of the century succeeding the government of Nehemiah. It would have been an abundant source of pleasure to the true believer in the divine legislation of Moses, had the picture been drawn by some able hand, of the peaceful state of the Jewish nation during this period; but the ancient historians had other views, and those who tread in their steps must not presume to supply by the force of imagination the deficiencies of ancient annals. One circumstance alone is recorded by Josephus as disturbing the public tranquillity between the times of Nehemiah and Alexander the Great: it is an instance of the dreadful consequences of anger, and the punishment of ambition, and it may also be considered as testifying such an increase of national wealth, as made the office of the High-priest an object worthy the regard of a man who aspired after power.

The age succeeding Nehemiah prosperous.

State of Judæa.

The Jews were subject to the kings of Persia, until the overthrow of that monarchy by Alexander, and paid a yearly tribute, to an extent which does not seem to have been oppressive. A governor appointed by the king held the supreme power in Judæa, but the internal administration of the government is considered to have been vested in the person of the High-priest.

B. C. 366. During the time Bagoses held the office of governor, Johanan the son of Judas was the High-priest, whose brother Joshua possessing great interest with Bagoses, obtained from him a promise of the High-priest's office; but whether the right of succession was promised only in the event of his brother's death, or it was intended to dispossess Johanan, is not distinctly stated by Josephus. Joshua so conducted himself on the strength of this promise, that, in a quarrel which took place between the two brothers in the Temple, Johanan slew Joshua. As soon as Bagoses received intelligence of this horrible event he came to Jerusalem, and charging upon the whole nation the crime of this sacrilege, he imposed a tribute of fifty drachmas for every lamb that was offered in the Temple; which was paid for seven years, but the payment of this imposition did not affect the Jews with anger so much as did the conduct of Bagoses, who profaned the Temple by entering into that court where none but circumcised persons were allowed to enter.

Murder of Joshua by Johanan the High priest.

Priesthood of Jaddua.

Jaddua, the son of Johanan, succeeded to the priesthood, whose brother Manasses, marrying the daughter of Sanballat, the governor of Samaria, is related by Josephus to have been the first High-priest of the temple at Mount Gerizim. This Jaddua was the High-priest who received Alexander at Jerusalem, and so successfully mitigated the conqueror's wrath. The circumstances of the transaction are interesting, and therefore we shall detail them at length.

In the second year after the victory over the Persians at the river Granicus, Alexander having pushed his conquests into Syria, and be-

sieged the city of Tyre, met with so valiant a resistance, that he was compelled to employ not less than seven months in the siege. Whilst occupied in reducing this important fortress, Alexander sent to demand the submission of the neighbouring provinces, and to require from the inhabitants supplies of provisions for the support of his army. The Jews alone refused compliance. Faithful to their sovereign, the king of Persia, they would not desert him, nor break the oath of allegiance they had taken; and accordingly they made answer to Alexander, that so long as Darius lived they were his subjects, and would own no other king. The Samaritans, on the contrary, not only complied with all his demands, but anxious to show their attachment to Alexander, and to testify the perfect sincerity of their submission, sent a body of eight thousand men to assist him at the siege. The fidelity of the one and the disloyalty of the other, met with rewards proportionable to their conduct; the time-serving disposition of the Samaritans being subsequently treated with contempt by Alexander, whilst under the controlling power of Providence, the firm faith of the Jews gained for them not less the admiration, than the protection, of the conqueror.

B. C. 332.

Arrival of Alexander in Asia.

Conduct of the Jews,

and of the Samaritans.

After the taking of Tyre, Alexander marched against Jerusalem, intending to punish the city for its disobedience to his commands. But the same God, who, for the sake of his servant David, had shielded the holy city from the assaults of Sennacherib, did not now desert his servants, nor suffer them to receive harm in the conscientious fulfilment of their national faith. On the approach of Alexander, Jaddua, in obedience to a revelation from heaven, went out to meet him on an eminence at a short distance from Jerusalem, clad in his pontifical robes, attended by the priests in their proper habits, and by the people in white garments. The conqueror was coming in anger to destroy, but no sooner did he see the High-priest advancing towards him thus accompanied, than, being struck with awe, he saluted him in the most reverend manner.

Alexander's progress to Jerusalem.

While all stood amazed at this behaviour, so contrary to their expectations, Parmenio inquired of Alexander the reasons that induced him to pay such adoration to the High-priest. To which Alexander answered, that he did not adore the priest, but the God, whose servant he was, and further added, that when he was at Dio, in Macedonia, deliberating concerning his war upon Persia, there appeared unto him in a dream a man like Jaddua, and clothed in the same habit; who encouraged him to his expedition, with the promise that God would be his guide, and would give him the empire of the Persians; that as soon as he saw the High-priest he recognised him to be the same that had appeared to him at Dio, and therefore in the person of the priest he adored the God, who had thus granted him a revelation of his will. Alexander kindly embraced Jaddua, and accompanying him to Jerusalem, offered sacrifices to God in the Temple; and being made acquainted by the High-priest with the prophecies of Daniel, which predicted the overthrow of the Persian empire by a Grecian king, he

Conduct of Alexander.

B. C. 332. derived from them the greatest encouragement to carry on the war against Darius, not doubting but that he was the person described in the prophetic books.

Alexander's favour to the Jews.

These circumstances so effectually recommended the Jews to the favour of Alexander, that when, at his departure, they petitioned him to allow them to live under their own laws, and in the free exercise of their religion, and further to be exempted from tribute every seventh year, because their law forbade them to cultivate the soil in the year of the sabbath, he immediately complied with their request. The Jews further implored his protection for their brethren whom he would find settled in Babylon; and many of them, won by his kindness, enlisted as soldiers in his service, and accompanied him on his expedition.

His behaviour to the Samaritans.

The Samaritans, envying the Jews the favour they had so unexpectedly gained, and jealous of the distinction conferred upon them, thought by a similar line of conduct to gain as much influence with the king. They met him as he returned from Jerusalem in a solemn religious procession, and professing their kindred with the Hebrews, sought from him a grant of the same privileges, which he had given to their brethren. Alexander excused himself from paying attention to their request till after his return from Egypt; but, during his absence, a rebellion taking place in the city, in which Andromachus, the governor, perished, on his return he caused all those who were concerned in the disturbance to be put to death, and driving out the Samaritans, planted their city with Macedonians: those who survived retired to Shechem, under Mount Gerizim, which from that time became the metropolis of the Samaritan sect. The eight thousand Samaritans who had joined Alexander at Tyre, and had been all along with him, he settled in Thebais, the remotest province of Egypt, lest their presence in Samaria should revive the mutinous spirit of their countrymen. This treatment contrasts strikingly with that which the Jews subsequently received, for when Alexandria was built, he settled therein many of that nation, giving them great privileges, and allowing them not only the use of their own laws and religion, but also the enjoyment of equal franchises and liberties with his own people, the Macedonians.

Influence of the preceding events upon Alexander's conduct.

It does not fall within our province to pursue the narration of Alexander's conquests, or to trace him in his rapid progress to the highest pinnacle of martial glory; one part, however, of his character is so closely connected with the occurrences related to have taken place on his arrival at Jerusalem, that we cannot forbear stopping to direct the reader's attention to it. It has often created surprise that a man of Alexander's strength of mind, should have been guilty of such folly and weakness as to feign himself to be the son of Jupiter Ammon, and to undertake a most laborious expedition to his temple, which was situated in the midst of the deserts of Lybia, and twelve days' journey from Memphis, for no other purpose than that of procuring himself the title of son of Jupiter.

The transactions with Jaddua, at Jerusalem, may serve to throw some light upon this part of Alexander's conduct. If Alexander was persuaded that he was the king of Græcia, prophesied by Daniel as the conqueror of the East, and that he was under the immediate protection of heaven, as being a man specially marked out to fulfil the destinies of the world, and if, as is probable, in conformity with the popular religion of Greece, he believed in the existence of the heroes of ancient days, those favoured mortals who were descended from the gods; it would appear almost a natural consequence of such a combination of circumstances acting on the mind of a heathen man, that he should believe himself to resemble Hercules and Bacchus, not only in their victories over the east, but in their descent from the thunderer of Olympus, and that, in conformity with this belief, he should compel the priest of Ammon publicly to declare the reality of that divine descent, of which himself had already received powerful and convincing evidence. That the Governor of the universe would by visions encourage a king to attempt conquests, foretel his success so plainly in the written prophecies of a foreign nation, grant him an almost universal empire, and do all this for one not most highly beloved in the courts of Heaven, was a notion that never could enter the mind of the religious men either of Greece or Rome; and however we may ridicule Alexander's conduct, it was still that error which a man in the full career of success, of a warm and sanguine temper, and under the influence of an idolatrous religion, could hardly avoid; an error which every event subsequent to the transactions at Jerusalem served only to confirm, and which was increased by every new success. B. C. 332.

Origin of the Samaritan nation, and of the temple at Mount Gerizim.

The history of the Samaritan nation is closely connected with this period in the annals of the Jews. We will therefore pause to give an account of its origin, and to state the leading points of the controversy which has existed, respecting the date of the building of the Samaritan temple upon Mount Gerizim. Under the name of Samaritans are included all the inhabitants of the country which was possessed by the Ten Tribes before their captivity. The name is derived from Samaria, a city in that part of the land of Israel belonging to the tribe of Ephraim, which was built by Omri, king of Israel, and became the capital of the Ten Tribes. The kingdom of Israel being destroyed by Salmanaser, and the Ten Tribes carried into captivity, never more to return, the king of Assyria repeopled the country with colonists from Babylon, Cuthath, and the neighbouring districts, and afterwards learning that the land was infested with lions, sent to punish the people for their gross ignorance of the true God, he gave orders for the return of some of the priests whom he had taken captive, and who were enjoined to teach the religion of the law of Moses to the new inhabitants. A corrupt religion was thus formed, by the strange union of the Mosaic institutions with the grossest superstitions of the heathen nations. But there is reason to believe that this religion became purer in its form at the time of the return of the Two Tribes from the captivity in Babylon,

B. C. 332. under Ezra and Zerubbabel; and to this may be attributed in some measure the desire expressed by the Samaritans to partake the benefits of the decree of Cyrus, for the rebuilding of the Temple at Jerusalem. But Zerubbabel refused their request, as being that of persons of a different nation from the Jews, though in part professing the same religion; and thence arose the perpetual enmity which afterwards subsisted between the two nations, for the Samaritans, in anger, used every endeavour to prevent the building of the Temple and the fortifying of the city at Jerusalem, and succeeded so far as to hinder the works being completed until the government of Nehemiah. The feud between the two nations seems also to have been increased by the establishment of that part of the ecclesiastical discipline by Ezra and Nehemiah, which compelled those Jews who had intermarried with the nations forbidden in the law of Moses, to put away their wives: the enforcement of this law caused Samaria to become the place of refuge for all who were weary of the painful observances of the law, and who sought a place where they might worship the God of Abraham, and yet be free from the severities of the Mosaic discipline.

Hostility between the Jews and Samaritans.

We may easily conceive with what feelings of abhorrence the devout Jews, on the one hand, would regard those who had connected themselves by marriage with those idolatrous nations whom God had so frequently commanded them to root out, as being the cause of their apostacy from his laws; and on the other, what a desire of revenge and retaliation for the infliction of injury would arise in the minds of those whom the strict enforcement of the law by the governors of the church compelled, either to relinquish their wives, or to give up their title of descent from Abraham and the patriarchs. It was natural that the Samaritan who professed himself a Jew in religion, not less than these excommunicated Jews, should desire to have a temple like that at Jerusalem, where they might worship the God of Moses. Accordingly we find that one was built on Mount Gerizim, and in process of time it was held by the Samaritans in even greater veneration than that at Jerusalem.

Much doubt exists respecting the time of the building of this temple, some authors making it contemporary with the excommunication of one of the sons of Joiada, the High-priest, in consequence of his having married the daughter of Sanballat, the Horonite, which circumstance is recorded in the 27th and 28th verses of the last chapter of the Book of Nehemiah. Others, on the contrary, following the authority of Josephus, refer the temple at Gerizim to the time of Alexander the Great. The latter seems to be the opinion most commonly received; but the learned author of the Connection of the Old and New Testament, having taken no inconsiderable pains to support the former hypothesis, we shall state the argument on both sides, as concisely as the nature of the argument will admit.

Controversy respecting date of the temple at Gerizim.

Josephus relates that Sanballat being governor of Samaria, under the last Darius, and thinking to acquire influence with the Jewish

Account given by Josephus.

nation, married his daughter to Manasses, the brother of Jaddua, B. C. 332. who had succeeded his father Johanan in the High-priesthood. The elders at Jerusalem, unwilling that Manasses, who had thus married a stranger, should share any part of the High-priest's authority, condemned his marriage, and obliged him either to repudiate his wife, or to suffer excommunication. Manasses was inclined to submit to the dissolution of the marriage, rather than lose the honour of the priesthood; but Sanballat, anxious for the honour of his daughter, persuaded Manasses to accept from him the authority of a High-priest at Samaria, promising him, at the same time, the succession to his authority as governor, and engaging, under permission of Darius, to build for him a temple at Mount Gerizim, like that at Jerusalem. Manasses then retired to Samaria, and it occasioned no small alarm, when it was discovered that all the priests, as well as the laity, at Jerusalem, who were similarly married to strangers, and their number was by no means inconsiderable, revolted to Manasses; Sanballat supplying them with the means of subsistence, giving them land to cultivate, and leaving nothing undone to gratify his son-in-law. Josephus farther relates, that Sanballat, considering the invasion of Alexander, as admirably suited for the full accomplishment of his plans, revolted from Darius, and joined Alexander with eight thousand men; and then communicating to him his wishes, both sought and obtained his permission to build the temple: that, after the arrival of Alexander at Jerusalem, nine months later, the Samaritans met him, and requested him to honour their temple with his presence.

Prideaux's examination of this story

Such is the account giving by Josephus. But Prideaux contends that Josephus has erred in placing the building of the temple in the reign of the last Darius Codomannus, and that he ought to have ascribed it to the time of Darius Nothus—that is, to the age of Nehemiah; that Josephus's account contains in itself a contradiction; for it was absolutely impossible that the temple at Gerizim could be built in the time of nine months, so that Alexander should have been invited to visit it, as Josephus relates he was, by the Samaritans, immediately after his coming to Jerusalem; especially, if it be considered, that during seven months of that time, Sanballat was at Tyre with Alexander assisting at the siege, and eight thousand of his people with him; that since Sanballat died nine months after the commencement of the siege of Tyre, the temple designed to be built by him, could not have been built under Alexander's permission after his death, because the Samaritans were then quite out of favour with Alexander; being, on account of their rebellion, deprived of their city, which was given to the Macedonians, and themselves reduced to the greatest distress.

Thus much as to the internal evidence of the falsity of Josephus's account. Prideaux admits that the temple at Gerizim was built by a Sanballat, who had married his daughter to the son of a High-priest at Jerusalem, but contends that this Sanballat, is Sanballat the Horonite, whose opposition to Nehemiah's designs for the restoration of Jeru-

B. C. 332. salem is recorded in the historical book of Nehemiah, and that the person mentioned in the 28th verse of the 12th chapter, is the same with Manasses, whom Josephus relates to have been the first High-priest in the Samaritan temple. "And one of the sons of Joiada, the son of Eliashib, the High-priest, was son-in-law of Sanballat, the Horonite; therefore I chased him from me." He grounds his proof of the identity of the Sanballat of Nehemiah, with the Sanballat of Josephus, on the similarity of their conduct; both being enemies of the Jews, and both having married their daughters to the son of a High-priest of the Jews. In the same manner, though Josephus places the marriage of Manasses in the High-priesthood of Jaddua, the grandson of Joiada, and says, that he who contracted it was the brother of Jaddua, and son of Johanan; yet Prideaux considers in the same way the similarity of the description of Manasseh given in Josephus, with the person mentioned in the 13th chapter of the book of Nehemiah, in the 28th verse, proof of the identity of the two persons; both being sons of a High-priest, both having married a daughter of a Sanballat, and both having been excommunicated for that offence.

The learned dean's argument is certainly plausible, and entitled to its due weight. If Josephus's testimony were contradictory to any single fact mentioned in the Scripture history, it would be conclusive against the historian; but we should always be unwilling to mistrust an historian, unless we are well assured we are justified in so doing; and when we consider how many of the apparent contradictions contained in the page of history, are to be attributed to our partial knowledge of the facts, we should rather desire to obtain a solution of the difficulty, than a plausible argument against the fact. We would therefore suggest, that the temple at Gerizim might have been proceeded upon before the arrival of Alexander in Syria, and even before the permission of Darius had been gained; and that Sanballat made this request to Alexander, as a further proof of his willing submission to his authority. It is not improbable, that, in the space of ninety years, there should have been two Sanballats, governors of Samaria, if a family of influence of that name were settled there: nor that, at a time when the marriages of Jews with heathens seems to have been a national vice, the sons of two High-priests should have been guilty of the same error; an error, which perhaps appeared pardonable as a means of procuring public quiet by the union of the two chief families of the rival nations; and which Manasses might have good reason to hope would escape the severe punishment inflicted as far back as the time of Nehemiah upon a similar offence.

B. C. 323. Division of the empire of Alexander.

We learn from profane history, that the empire of Alexander was, at his death, divided amongst his generals, who at first assumed no other title than that of governors of the provinces under Alexander, his posthumous son by Roxana, whom they had declared king jointly with Aridæus. But this division of the government did not last long: God had foretold, by the prophet Daniel, that four kings should arise

and divide the Macedonian empire between them; and it accordingly came to pass, that these generals, disputing with each other, kept up continual warfare, until, in the space of a few years, their number was reduced to four,—Cassander, Lysimachus, Ptolemy, and Seleucus. Cassander had Macedon and Greece; Lysimachus, Thrace and that part of Asia which is contiguous to the Hellespont; Ptolemy, Egypt, Libya, Arabia, Palestine, and Cœle-Syria; and Seleucus the rest. In the contests which took place between the Ptolemies and the successors of Seleucus, Judæa suffered considerably. Lying between Egypt and Syria, the kings of those countries were equally desirous to attach it to their dominion; and by its situation it became, not only the prize of the contest, but the arena upon which the combatants fought for the victory. In the first division of Alexander's empire, Syria, Phœnicia, and Judæa, were allotted to Laomedon of Mitylene; but Ptolemy, soon perceiving how conveniently those countries were situated both for the defence of Egypt, and for any attempt he might be desirous of making upon Cyprus, resolved to make himself master of them. Ptolemy at first tried to purchase of Laomedon his portion of the empire; but not being able to prevail upon him, he determined to obtain it by force, and sent Nicanor to invade the country, who speedily conquered Laomedon, and gained for Ptolemy the entire possession of the territory. The Jews alone refusing to submit to their new master, Ptolemy marched into Judæa, and laid siege to Jerusalem, which he took after some time, by storming the place on a Sabbath. Josephus relates that Ptolemy gained admission under pretence of doing sacrifice in the Temple, and took the city by treachery. The learned Prideaux supposes that Josephus, in asserting that the city was thus taken, gives a false colouring to this transaction, lest he should expose his nation to the contempt of the Greeks, for so ridiculous a folly as that of not defending themselves when attacked on the Sabbath. But there is no reason for supposing that Josephus would wilfully falsify his narrative on such an account; and if we examine attentively the whole passage, we shall see clearly that the Jewish historian means his reader to understand, that, had the Jews suspected Ptolemy, they would not have yielded so easily, and that their city was taken through their keeping the Sabbath, in the confidence that Ptolemy would not deal treacherously towards them. "Ptolemy," says he, "took Jerusalem by using deceit; for when he had come into the city, under pretence of doing sacrifice, and the Jews had forborne to oppose his entrance, not suspecting his hostile intention, and through this absence of all suspicion, as well as the sacredness of the day, were in a state of idleness and rest, he without difficulty made himself master of the city."*

B. C. 323.

Fate of Syria and Judæa.

B. C. 320.

Jerusalem taken by Ptolemy.

Undoubtedly the city was captured, because the Jews were keep-

* Εισελθὼν γὰρ Σαββάτοις εἰς τὴν πόλιν ὡς θύσων, μήτε τῶν Ιουδαίων αὐτὸν ἀμυνομένων, οὐδὲ γὰρ ὑπενόουν πολέμιον, καὶ διὰ τὸ ἀνύποπτον καὶ τὴν ἡμέραν ἐν ἀργίᾳ καὶ ῥᾳθυμίᾳ τυγχανόντων, ἀπίνως ἐγχρατὴς γίνεται τῆς πόλεως. *Antiq.* l. xii. c. i.

B. C. 320. ing the Sabbath on that occasion; but such an observance of the Sabbath, which would occasion the walls to be unmanned, and the guards released from the strictness of their discipline, would be caused by the conduct of Ptolemy, in requesting to be allowed to enter the city for the purpose of sacrificing in the Temple. And so far was Josephus from wishing to hide this transaction, that he seems rather to have gloried in the simplicity of his countrymen, and to have considered it an honourable testimony of their minds being more attentive to their duty to God, than to the preservation of their lives and liberties; for in his book against Apion, in replying to the ridicule cast by Agatharchides on his countrymen, for suffering their city to be taken on the Sabbath, he has this remarkable expression—"Agatharchides may call this transaction one worthy of ridicule, but to those who examine the subject with minds free from evil intention, that conduct will appear worthy of the highest encomiums, which has led some men constantly to regard obedience to the laws and piety to God before their own safety, or the freedom of their country." Τοῦτο μὲν Ἀγαθαρχίδῃ καταγέλωτος ἄξιον δόκει· τοις δὲ μὴ μετὰ δυσμενείας ἐξετάζουσι φαίνεται μέγα καὶ πολλῶν ἄξιον ἐγκωμίων ἐι καὶ σωτηρέας καὶ πατριδος ἄνθρωποί τινες νόμων φυλακὴν καὶ τὴν πρὸς Θεὸν ἐυσεβέιαν ἀεὶ προτιμῶσιν.—(L. i. c. 22.) He does not appear to think it worth attempting any elaborate defence of his countrymen; for if, in his history, which was written prior to this book against Apion, he had forged the story of Ptolemy's treachery for the purpose of concealing the truth, in his subsequent work he would surely have defended his former statement, by asserting the probability of his account; he would have expatiated upon Ptolemy's conduct, and have endeavoured to show how likely it was to deceive the Jews, and would not have rested satisfied with stating in plain terms a circumstance of which he was ashamed. The city thus captured, Ptolemy at first treated the Jews with severity, and carried above a hundred thousand captives into Egypt; but, subsequently calling to mind the fidelity with which they had always served their masters, and that a loyal but not a rebellious spirit had caused their misfortunes, he thought such persons qualified for stations of trust, and therefore, selecting from them thirty thousand for military service, he placed them as garrisons in the most important fortresses of his empire. Some of them he settled at Lybia and Cyrene, and from them were descended the Cyrenian Jews, a tribe for whom we cannot but feel interested, since to it belonged Simon the Cyrenian, who bore our Lord's cross on the way to Calvary, and others, who are mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles. So long as the power of the Ptolemies in Egypt enabled them to defend their frontiers successfully against the descendants of Seleucus, Judæa and Cœle-Syria remained in their possession; but as their empire declined, the kings of Syria made good their encroachments upon the territories of the kings of Egypt; and Judæa fell with Syria under their government. The

Imputations of superstition cast upon the Jews.

Conduct of Ptolemy to the Jews.

Jews, however, notwithstanding the frequent incursions made into their country by the contending parties, increased in commercial prosperity: they paid a regular tribute to the Ptolemies; but the internal government of Judæa seems to have been confided to their own rulers. The protection afforded to the Jews by the Egyptian princes, but especially by Ptolemy Soter, occasioned many of them to emigrate, and settle in Egypt, and especially at Alexandria, where they still continued to enjoy equal privileges with the Macedonian colonists. By this means it pleased the Divine Providence to prepare the way for the completion of that great and important work, the translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek, in that version, which, from the supposed number of the translators, has been called the Septuagint. The knowledge of the true God became more extended, and the Creator may indeed be said not to have left himself without witness, in that his favoured nation, who were in those days, as they are at the present time, scattered over the world, were preserved by him as a distinct nation, notwithstanding the natural causes that tended to assimilate them with the various nations amongst whom they dwelt. But Egypt was not the only spot where the Jewish people found protection. When Seleucus became possessed of the empire of Asia, 300 B. C., and built numerous cities in Syria, and Asia Minor, in all of them he planted Jews, and gave them equal immunities and privileges with the Greeks and Macedonians, and especially at Antioch in Syria, where they settled in great numbers, and became almost as great a part of the people as they were at Alexandria. In the countries beyond the Euphrates, and at Babylon, they also existed in great numbers; and when we consider what a principle of fidelity to their governors at that time pervaded the nation, it is most likely that they contributed very materially to the establishment of the empire of Seleucus, and his settling them so numerously in his own cities is a proof how mainly he depended upon them for assistance in the further increase and support of it.

B. C. 320.

Egypt frequented by Jews.

B. C. 300.

Protection afforded to the Jewish nation by the Seleucidæ.

And if we may judge from the conduct of Antiochus the Great, the same honourable feelings of loyalty to their kings continued to exist at a still later period; for it is related, that when the state of the country in Phrygia and Lydia was considerably disturbed by intestine commotions, Antiochus the Great, having experienced the great steadiness with which these eastern Jews always submitted to their governors, sent two thousand of their families from Mesopotamia and Babylonia into those parts, to keep in check the seditious spirit of the former inhabitants; and from them thus transplanted from Syria and Babylon, were descended most of the Jews whom we find scattered in great numbers all over the Lesser Asia, at the time of the first promulgation of the Gospel.

B. C. 198.

We have stated that Cœle-Syria and Palestine were continually exposed to invasions from the contending kings of Egypt and Syria. These wars were terminated by the subjection of that country to

B. C. 300. the Syrian princes. To pursue this intricate portion of Jewish history through all its minute details, down to the final possession of Judæa
B. C. 175. by Antiochus Epiphanes, and to the war of the Maccabees, would be unproductive of any benefit: we shall therefore content ourselves with the relation of those circumstances of prominent interest to the Jewish nation, which occurred during this period. The most important event we have to record during the whole period of time from the conquest of Alexander to the birth of Christ, is the translation of

Origin of the Greek Septuagint.

the Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament into Greek, in the version called the Septuagint. If we were to credit the history of this memorable work, as given by a person who wrote under the name of
B. C. 277. Aristeas, we should place its accomplishment in the year 277 B. C., during the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus. For the examination of the controversy respecting the origin of this translation, we must refer the reader to other authorities; we shall here only state that a probable source of this translation is the change of language which naturally took place amongst the Jews at Alexandria; for the bulk of the common people, not preserving their knowledge of the biblical Hebrew, but using the Greek language in their intercourse with the people amongst whom they dwelt, a translation of the Law, at least, would be necessary, in order to teach them their duty by means of that language with which they were best acquainted. In the time of Ezra, when the Scriptures were read, it was customary to interpret them in the Chaldee, the people being more familiar with that dialect of the Hebrew language, in consequence of their long residence in Babylon; and in the same manner it is highly probable that the custom of interpreting the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek might have prevailed in the synagogues at Alexandria, many years before a regular translation was effected. We can scarcely conceive that Ptolemy Philadelphus would have neglected to procure some copies of the religious laws of the nation, whose people formed so great a part of the inhabitants of the capital city of his empire, at a time when he was forming a collection of books from all parts of the world; and it does not appear improbable that, when the Hebrew language was one so little known to any but the Jews, the king should have ordered a translation of them to be made, with the view of making those learned men who were ignorant of the Hebrew language, acquainted with the laws of the Jews. This theory would account for all the fabulous stories of the short period of time in which the work was accomplished, which indeed would only be the labour of committing to writing an interpretation which was every sabbath-day orally delivered in the synagogues. The books of the prophets were not commonly read in the synagogues till after the time of the Maccabees; and we find in the Septuagint version such a difference in the correctness of the version of the Pentateuch, and the books of the prophets, as would lead us to conclude that the translators of the Law were far better skilled in the knowledge of the Hebrew language

than those who after them translated the books of the prophets; a circumstance which tends to prove the gradual accomplishment of the translation, against the opinions of those who think it was completed at one time. We may then, not without reason, regard the Septuagint version as a work that gradually came into existence, as the wants of the Jewish church at Alexandria required, the five books of the Law, and the book of Job, being first edited in a written translation, at a time when the Hebrew language was accurately understood, and the succeeding books being translated at later periods, and therefore liable to those imperfections which would naturally result from a less perfect acquaintance with the original language. B. C. 277.

Persecution of the Jews at Alexandria by Ptolemy Philopator.

The next occurrence worthy of notice is a dreadful persecution of the Jews at Alexandria, which arose in the following manner. In the year 217 B. C., Ptolemy Philopator waging war with Antiochus the Great for the possession of Cœle-Syria, overthrew him with great loss at Raphia, a town lying between Rhinocorura and Gaza, and compelled him to retreat to Antioch. On the retreat of Antiochus all the cities of Palestine and Cœle-Syria, and amongst them the city of Jerusalem sent embassies to renew their submission to Ptolemy, for having been long under the government of the Egyptians, they still retained their affection to their old masters. Ptolemy soon after made a progress through the country, and coming to Jerusalem, offered many sacrifices and oblations in the Temple; but being desirous of admission into the inner court he would have pressed into the sanctuary, and into the Holy of Holies, where the High-priest alone was permitted to enter once in the year on the great day of expiation. This occasioned no small uproar in the city. The High-priest explained to him the sacredness of the place, and the prohibition contained in the law; the priests and Levites assembled with the people, and implored him to desist from his purpose, but the king, persisting, came into the inner court, and was going into the Temple itself, when he was seized with so great a terror and confusion of mind, that he fell down and was carried out apparently dead. Recovering from his sickness, he departed from Jerusalem in great wrath, and venting forth many threatenings against the whole nation of the Jews. On his return to Alexandria he began to visit his anger against the Jews of Jerusalem upon those of Alexandria, and published a decree forbidding those to enter his presence who did not sacrifice to the gods whom he worshipped. This decree was in effect a putting the Jewish nation out of the protection of the law, for it prevented any Jews from suing for justice in the king's court. And whereas the Jews of Alexandria ranked equally with the Macedonians, the original founders of the city, by another decree he commanded them to be enrolled in the lowest order, and at the time of enrolment to be branded with a hot iron, the impress of which was an ivy leaf, the badge of his god, Bacchus; at the same time he allowed as many of the Jews as would be initiated into the heathen religion to retain their privileges, and remain in the same rank. B. C. 217.

B. C. 217. Of the many thousands of Jews at Alexandria there were found but three thousand ready to forsake their God in order to secure the favour of their king. The remainder stood firm in the profession of their religion, choosing rather to suffer the greatest evils than to apostatise from the faith. Those who submitted to the king were so abhorred by their countrymen, that they would have no communication with men who were guilty of such great impiety, and this being interpreted as done in opposition to the royal authority, so enraged Ptolemy that he resolved to extirpate the whole nation, and commanding all the Jews in Egypt to be brought in chains to Alexandria, there shut up great numbers of them in the Hippodrome, (a large place without the city, where the people assembled to see horse races and other shows,) intending to destroy them with his elephants. For two days they remained confined in this place, the execution being delayed in consequence of Ptolemy's drunken carousals, which prevented his thinking of the proposed massacre till too late in each day to accomplish it. But the third day the king himself being present, the elephants were brought forth and made drunk with wine, that they might more fiercely execute his rage against the people; but instead of attacking the Jews, they fell upon those who came to be spectators of the massacre, and destroyed many. Ptolemy considering this a divine interposition, no longer dared prosecute his rage against the Jews, but restored them to their privileges, and revoked the decrees he had made.*

B. C. 204. The Jews again become subject to the princes of Syria.

In the subsequent reign of Ptolemy Epiphanes, the Jews were quite alienated in their affections from the Egyptian princes, and willingly submitted themselves to the authority of Antiochus the Great, who in return bestowed many favours upon the nation and gave them his entire protection. To Antiochus the Great, Seleucus Philopator succeeded in the kingdom of Syria: during his reign, Simon, a Benjamite, the governor of the Temple, quarrelling with Onias the High-priest, went in revenge to Apollonius the governor of Cœle-Syria, under Seleucus, and informing him that great wealth was hoarded in the Temple of Jerusalem, advised him to seize it in behalf of the king. Heliodorus, the king's treasurer, was sent upon this information to get

B. C. 176. possession of it, who came to Jerusalem, and notwithstanding the earnest supplication of the priests and people, persisted in endeavouring to fulfil the king's commands. In the second book of Maccabees, the third chapter, it is related, that the hand of God in a most miraculous manner prevented the sacrilege: for upon Heliodorus approaching the

* This account is contained in the third book of the history of the Maccabees: this book being of less authority than the two first books of the Maccabees is omitted in our English translation, but it is extant in the Syriac language, and is in most of the ancient manuscript copies of the Greek Septuagint. The name Maccabees was of later origin than the time of this persecution, but because the Jews at Alexandria suffered in the cause of religion, as did the real Maccabees; for this reason, these, as well as others, who endured martyrdom for the profession of the truth, were called Maccabees by the later Jews. 198 B. C.

treasury there appeared a vision of a man on horseback, who ran B. C. 176
against him and struck him to the ground with such force that he was taken up speechless, and almost without life. Heliodorus recovered, and having offered sacrifice in the Temple for his preservation returned to the king, and being asked by him whether he knew any man who was fit to go again on the business to Jerusalem, he answered—"If thou hast any enemy or traitor send him thither, and thou shalt receive him well scourged, if he escape with his life; for in that place no doubt there is an especial power of God; for He that dwelleth in heaven hath his eye on that place, and defendeth it, and He beateth and destroyeth them that hurt it."

CHAPTER II.

REVIEW OF THE STATE OF RELIGION IN JUDÆA FROM THE TIME OF NEHEMIAH TO THE TIME OF THE MACCABEES.

FROM A. M. 3595, B. C. 409, TO A. M. 3836, B. C. 168.

Rise of the Maccabees.

WE have now brought down the Jewish History to the time of the Maccabees, and the government of that race of princes called the Asamonean princes. The origin of the Maccabees is so closely connected with the state of religion, that we must trace its varying condition during the preceding centuries from the time of Nehemiah, in the year 3559. in order to form a right estimate of the circumstances which led to the establishment of the descendants of Asamoneus on the throne of Judæa. In this period of time, including, according to Prideaux, a space of 260 years from the last visit of Nehemiah to Jerusalem, (mentioned in the sixth verse of the 13th chapter of the book of Nehemiah,) the death of Simon the Just, forms a distinguishing epocha. The Jews tell us that Simon was the last of the men of the Great Synagogue, consisting of 120 persons, which returned with Ezra from the captivity in Babylon, and was established for two reasons; first, for the purpose of restoring the observance of the Law according to the practice which existed before the captivity; and, secondly, to collect all the sacred books into one body, and to compose the canon of Scripture. They pretend that, after Ezra, Daniel and his three companions, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, held the first places in this assembly: that Simon the Just sat at the lower end, and that all these persons were contemporary; but this is quite irreconcilable with their chronology.

Progress of religion from the time of Ezra.

B. C. 292.

The Great Synagogue.

Simon the Just.

The Jews tell us very extraordinary things of this High-priest, Simon the Just.

1st. It is said, in the Talmud of Jerusalem, that during the whole of his pontificate, the goat azazel, the scape-goat, was dashed to pieces before he could fall half way down the precipice over which he was thrown; whereas, after the death of this great man, the goat escaped into the desert, where he was caught and eaten by the Saracens; which was considered as a great misfortune.

2ndly. During his whole life, when, on the day of solemn expiation, the High-priest drew lots on the two goats, that which he drew with his right hand had always the inscription, "Pray to God;" and that which he drew with his left hand was always for the azazel, or scape-

goat; whereas after his death this varied, and the High-priest sometimes drew the lot for the azazel with his right hand; which was taken for an evil omen. B. C. 292.

3rdly. The scarlet ribbon which was tied to the head of the goat azazel (this was not appointed in Scripture; but, however, custom had given it authority,) always appeared white during the pontificate of Simon the Just; which was looked upon as a proof of the remission of the sins of the people, according to those words of Isaiah (chap i. v. 18), "Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be white as snow." But after the death of Simon this also varied, and the scarlet ribbon appeared sometimes red and sometimes white.

4thly. While he lived the western lamp of the golden candlestick was always burning, but after his death it sometimes went out.

5thly. While he lived the fire of the altar burned clear: and after a billet or two was put on it in the morning, there was no occasion for any more wood during the whole day; but when he was dead, the fire languished, and required a continual supply to keep it in.

6thly. While he lived, the blessings of God multiplied the two loaves of first fruits, offered on the day of Pentecost, and the twelve loaves of shew-bread set upon the golden altar in the Sanctum, and which were left there the whole week till the Sabbath following, when others were put there in their stead. These loaves, they say, were multiplied so, that when they were distributed to all the priests that waited in the Temple, as a kind of blessing, each had, at least, a piece as big as an olive, which was enough for his refreshment; and some had to spare. But when he was dead, this blessing ceased, and the shares distributed among the priests were so small that the more modest returned their thanks, and the others still held out their hands.

Relizion flourished down to his time.

These stories can have no other foundation than the existence of religion in a prosperous state under his priesthood. The exaggeration must be pardoned, for men even in these days are not exempt from the common error of describing the happiness of former ages in terms, which, as they are beyond credibility, serve no other purpose than that of testifying the existence of prosperity. The truth of the whole is probably this, that Ezra was assisted in his labours by some persons who partook with him his zeal for the reformation of religion; that the same spirit which animated them, continued for some time to influence those who succeeded them in the government of the church; and that Simon's known attachment to religion, and the exertions he made during his life for the preservation of right principles among his countrymen, procured for him the traditionary honour of having been one of those who assisted in the early reformation of the Jewish church.

Change in the ecclesiastical government.

Without lingering upon these Jewish fables, we proceed to notice a change of some importance, which took place at Simon's death, in the ecclesiastical government at Jerusalem. Simon the Just, and probably all his predecessors, had united with the High-priesthood the Presidency of the Sanhedrim or National Council; but Eleazar his brother, who B. C. 292.

B. C. 292. succeeded him in the priesthood, yielded the Presidency to Antigonus of Socho, a man of great eminence on account of his learning in the Law of Moses, and who taught the Law to the people. He was the founder of the school of the Tannain or Mishnical Doctors, by which name all the doctors of the Jewish Law are distinguished, who lived between the death of Simon and the middle of the second century after Christ, when Rabbi Judah Kakkodesh composed the Mishna. In the gospels these Doctors are called Scribes or Lawyers, and are described as those who sat in Moses' seat. This is the first notice we have of the establishment of Divinity Schools among the Jews. The men of the great synagogue only taught the Scriptures to the people, but the doctors who succeeded added also the Traditions of the elders, and held that they were of equal obligation, as if both had equally been delivered from Mount Sinai.

Divinity Schools established and the traditions of the elders taught to the people.

Antigonus continued in this employment for twenty-eight years, and died: another change was then effected in the constitution of the Sanhedrim and the Divinity School, by the appointment of a vice president, who taught jointly in the chief school at Jerusalem: a fact which shows a considerable increase in the demand made by the people at large for this sort of instruction. As might naturally be expected, the establishment of schools of Divinity, and the corruption of the Law by the introduction of Tradition, would give rise to the promulgation of a great variety of opinions. The Jews ascribe the origin of the sect of the Sadducees to the method of instruction pursued by Antigonus; for, having in his lectures inculcated, that God is to be obeyed not for the sake of reward, but from filial love and fear only, two of his scholars, Sadoc and Baithus, took upon them to infer the non-existence of rewards after this life, and then, separating from the school of their master, taught that there was no resurrection or future state, but that all the rewards given by God were only relative to this life: thus began the sect, which from Sadoc were called Sadducees, who differed from the followers of Epicurus only in this, that they allowed the power and the providence of God over the world, whereas, the Epicureans deny not only the doctrine of a resurrection, but that of a providential superintendence of this life. Whether this account be true or not, of this we can have no doubt, that the establishment of a School of Divinity, wherein that noble and most excellent portion of knowledge is taught, more as a matter of science, than as a means of progress in all practical obedience and duty to God, has in the nature of things a very great tendency to assist the propagation of false opinions, while men, forgetting the object to which alone their minds ought to be directed in such studies, take the principles of religion as weapons to use in combat for the prize of superiority over an antagonist in argument, and are content if they gain the victory, even though it be by the sacrifice of some portion of sacred truth.

Rise of the Sadducees. B. C. 260.

Effects of School Divinity.

We must keep in mind that, in the interval of time between the death of Simon the Just and the rise of the Maccabees, the opinions

of Epicurus began to be broached in the heathen world, and it is not surprising when we consider the great intercourse the Jews then had with foreign nations, that the great enemy of man should succeed in infecting Judæa, as well as other parts of the world, with the atheistic spirit of the age. It may seem strange to some, that we should assert the existence of atheistic principles among the Jews at the time of the rise of the Maccabees; but we have good evidence of the fact, in the conduct of Jason and Menelaus, who became High-priests at Jerusalem, by the supplanting of Onias a short time prior to the persecution of the Jews by Antiochus; and indeed if this evidence were wanting, the dreadful sufferings of the Jews under Antiochus Epiphanes, would lead any one who is acquainted with the ways of God's providence over the Jewish nation, to suspect that there existed amongst that nation such a sort of apostacy from the law of Moses, as might well bring down upon it the severity of God's avenging justice.

B. C. 260.

Rise of atheistical principles in Judæa.

B. C. 175.

Heathenish High-priests.

As soon as Antiochus Epiphanes was settled in his kingdom, Jason, the brother of Onias the High-priest, being ambitious of the honour and power of that office, offered to Antiochus no less a sum than three hundred and sixty talents if he would dispossess his brother, and make him High-priest in his stead. Antiochus could not resist so large a bribe, and by the advice of Jason, summoned Onias to attend him at Antioch, where he was kept in confinement till he was put to death. It was necessary to remove Onias from Jerusalem, for had he remained there, so great was the character of his virtues, and the affection of the people towards him, that Jason's power would have been of little avail against the influence of Onias. Jason, having no hope of support from those who were attached to Onias on account of his care of religion, did all in his power to increase the strength and power of the opposite party, of those who were already attached to the customs and superstitions of the Gentile nations. He purchased from Antiochus, at the further price of one hundred and fifty talents, a license to erect at Jerusalem a Gymnasium, or place of exercise, and an Ephebeum, or a place for training up youth in the usages of the Greeks, and at the same time procured authority to make as many of the inhabitants of Jerusalem as he pleased freemen of Antioch. By these means he encouraged apostacy from the law of Moses, and induced the people to neglect the manners of their forefathers, and conform themselves to the customs of the heathens. The altar was neglected, and the priests themselves omitted the public worship of the Temple, to partake of the amusements of the Gymnasium. Not content with changing his religion, Jason changed his name also, for his name was at first Jesus, but when he inclined to the Greek superstitions, he assumed that of Jason, to show how entirely he desired to be considered no longer a Jew, but a worshipper of foreign deities. The year after his appointment to the High-priesthood, the Quinquennial games were celebrated at Tyre, in honour of Hercules the tutelary deity of the country. To them Jason sent some of his friends, whom he had made freemen of

Jason supplants Onias his brother.

Encourages apostacy from the law of Moses.

B. C. 175. Antioch, to be spectators of the games, and to offer a donation to be expended in sacrifices to the heathen deity; but those who carried the offering had so much fear of their God Jehovah remaining in them, as not to involve themselves in the guilt of this idolatry, and instead of giving the money for the use of the games, they presented it to the Tyrians towards the repair of their fleet.

Infidelity existed at Jerusalem prior to Jason's priesthood.

But it would be wrong to consider Jason as the sole origin of this apostacy: there must have previously existed at Jerusalem a party inclined to heathenism, or the propositions of Jason for the establishment of customs so contrary to the spirit of the law of Moses, would have been rejected by the people with indignation. The change from the pure worship of God to the impure services of paganism is not made in an instant. Infidelity may progress with hasty steps, but its first approach must be made by the successive destruction and removal of religious impressions; and we may be assured that whenever a public demonstration is made of its existence, it is in fact only the discovery of a fire which has been smothering for a length of time, and is at last blown into a vigorous flame by some sudden change of circumstances. But such iniquity as that of which Jason was guilty, could not remain long in prosperity: he that had so wickedly deposed his brother, was condemned in his turn to experience the ingratitude and treachery of a brother; for in the third year of his priesthood, his brother Menelaus being sent by him to Antioch, for the purpose of conveying tribute to the king, and treating with him upon other affairs, took advantage of the opportunity afforded him by this mission to supplant his brother in the authority he had unjustly acquired.

Menelaus supplants Jason.

An offer of three hundred talents more than Jason had given for the priesthood, easily persuaded Antiochus to depose Jason, and Menelaus returned to Jerusalem with the mandate of the king for his establishment in that office. But Jason's party was too powerful to submit at once to the authority of Menelaus, who returned to Antioch; and there declaring that he would only adhere to the religion of the king, and the worship of the Greeks, obtained from him a sufficient force to expel Jason, and put him in quiet possession of the supreme power. Menelaus kept his word faithfully, and proceeded to encourage the prevalence of apostacy to the very utmost of his power. His name, as well as that of his elder brother, is said to have been originally Onias; but, following the example of his brother Jason, he changed his name to Menelaus, in testimony of his reception of the religion of the Greeks.

We may here observe, that the object that Jason and Menelaus had in view, was not the mere honour of the ecclesiastical authority, but the temporal power which had for some ages since the time of Nehemiah been united to the office of High-priest. And the vast sums of money given by these two men as bribes to Antiochus, would plainly shew that the Jewish nation must have been at this time in the enjoyment of very considerable commercial prosperity, to allow of such large

revenues being collected by the High-priest, as might remunerate him for paying so great a price for the office. And the circumstance, that the freedom of the city of Antioch was valuable enough to tempt a Jew to apostacy, is also an evidence of the existence of much commercial intercourse between Jerusalem and Antioch; for to one resident at Jerusalem the freedom could only be valuable in consequence of the advantages those who possessed it obtained over their fellow-countrymen, in exemption from duties and taxes. Menelaus either neglected or was unable to pay the sum he had agreed to give to Antiochus, and was summoned to appear before the king at Antioch; but fortunate circumstances concurring to delay his appearance, he contrived in the meantime to raise the money, partly by selling the golden vessels which belonged to the Temple at Jerusalem. So daring a sacrilege caused a great mutiny amongst the people, who fell upon Lysimachus, his brother, whom Menelaus had left in charge, and slew him in the Temple. Onias, the High-priest, was still in confinement at Antioch, and hearing of the sacrilege committed by the orders of Menelaus upon the vessels of the Temple, sent and reproved him for his conduct; which so irritated Menelaus, that he could not rest until he had persuaded Andronicus, the governor of Antioch, to put Onias to death. B. C. 175.

Onias put to death.

But Antiochus, on his return, avenged the death of this good man upon Andronicus, whom he commanded to be carried as a malefactor to the spot where Onias was murdered, and there to be put to death. The conduct of Menelaus continued so ungovernable, that the Jews, no longer able to endure his sacrilegious proceedings, sent delegates to Tyre, where the king then abode, to seek redress at his hands; but Menelaus, by means of bribes, procured a friend of the king's so far to interest himself in his favour, as to persuade the king entirely to acquit Menelaus of the charge, and to put to death the persons sent from Jerusalem to complain of his behaviour. So manifest an injustice excited the pity of the people of the city, who took up their bodies, and interred them honourably. Such was the condition of the Jewish nation under the High-priesthood of Menelaus. Such a man, a tyrant in conduct, and an infidel in principle, could never have maintained himself in his authority, unless supported by a party of similarly depraved habits and dispositions. We might expect that the God of Moses would not long permit his people to continue in the practice of heathenish customs, and in apostacy from the strict performance of the law delivered at Mount Sinai, without punishing them in so exemplary a manner, as to convince them of their error, and teach them the value of their religion, by depriving them of the means of continuing the public exercise of it: that punishment took place in the persecution of the Jews by Antiochus, which we are now to describe, and which drew forth the valour and the constancy of the Maccabees.

Tyranny of Menelaus.

The times we are now describing were full of trouble and dismay to the Jewish church; and, as ominous appearances in the heavens portended the final destruction of Jerusalem, so also, a short time B. C. 170.

B. C. 170. prior to the calamities which befel the city in the persecution of Antiochus, similar warnings were given of the approaching desolation.

Ominous appearances at Jerusalem.

"About the same time" (says the author of the second book of the Maccabees, in the second chapter), "Antiochus prepared for his second voyage into Egypt, and then it happened, that through all the city, for the space of almost forty days, there were seen horsemen running in the air in cloth of gold, and armed with lances like a band of soldiers, and troops of horsemen in array encountering and running one against another with shaking of shields, and multitude of pikes, and drawing of swords, and casting of darts, and glittering of golden ornaments, and harness of all sorts. Wherefore every man prayed that that apparition might turn to good." Antiochus being in Egypt, a false rumour arose of his death, whereupon Jason, thinking this a good opportunity to attempt the recovery of the priesthood, of which he had been deprived by his brother Menelaus, marched against Jerusalem with a force of a thousand men; and being assisted by his party within, succeeded in taking the city, and driving Menelaus for shelter into the castle. In his mad rejoicing at the capture of the city, he committed all kinds of cruelty upon his fellow-citizens, and put to death without mercy all who fell into his power, whom he thought to be his adversaries.

Antiochus takes Jerusalem.

Antiochus learned what had taken place; and supposing that all the Jewish nation were in a state of revolt, marched from Egypt into Judæa to quell the rebellion; and his anger being further kindled, by hearing that the people of Jerusalem had made great rejoicings at the news of his death, in a rage he laid siege to Jerusalem, and taking it by force, he put to death, in the space of three days, as many as forty thousand of the inhabitants, and sold as many more as slaves. Jason had fled immediately on hearing of the march of Antiochus towards Jerusalem, and taken refuge in the country of the Ammonites; but he was not suffered to remain there; and being driven from place to place, first into Egypt, then into Lacedæmonia, he there died in exile and misery, without a single friend to provide him with the rites of burial. The fury of Antiochus could not be satiated by slaughter; he had vented his rage upon the people, but he could not rest without polluting the Temple, and thereby offering insult to their God; and in this impiety and sacrilege he found a ready guide in the wicked apostate Menelaus, who conducted him into the inmost courts of the Temple, and even into the Holy of Holies. And still further, to affront the Majesty of the God of Israel, and to show his contempt of that religion which He had enjoined, he sacrificed a sow upon the altar, and boiling some part of the flesh in water, with it sprinkled the Temple, on purpose to pollute and defile it. He then plundered it of all its valuable utensils, amongst which were the altar of incense, the table of the shew-bread, the golden candlestick, and of all the offerings which had been made in it, to the value of eighteen hundred talents of gold; and spoiling the city in the same way, returned to Antioch loaded with

Pollutes the Temple.

the immense treasure which he had collected by plunder both in Egypt and in Judæa. Menelaus was left by him in the office of High-priest, but separate governors were appointed over Judæa and Samaria. These, however, were but the beginnings of sorrows; for two years after, Antiochus returning unsuccessful from his campaign upon Egypt, and having suffered a defeat there from the Romans, visited the whole of his anger upon the Jews, who had given him no fresh cause of offence. In his way through Palestine, he detached twenty-two thousand men under the command of Apollonius, and sent them to destroy the city of Jerusalem. Apollonius entered the city peaceably; but on the following sabbath, at the time when all the people were assembled in the synagogues for the purpose of worshipping God, he let loose his soldiers upon them, and committed the most horrible massacre, sparing neither sex, nor age, and making the very streets flow with blood. He then plundered the city and set it on fire, and with the ruins built a castle on the top of an eminence which commanded the Temple, establishing in it a strong garrison, and making it the storehouse for their arms and provisions. At such a season the devout Jew would fly to the Temple to intercede with his God in behalf of his suffering people; but piety and devotion were no protection, for the soldiers attacked all who came up to worship, and shed their blood even in the sanctuary. For the space of three years and a half, the time prophesied by Daniel, (in the 12th chapter, 7th verse,) in the words a time, times, and half a time, the Temple lay desolate, and the sacrifices ceased, until, as will be hereafter related, the Temple was recovered out of the hands of the heathens by the success of Judas Maccabeus, and dedicated anew to the worship of God.

B. C. 170.

Attempts to destroy the city.

The hostility of Antiochus was not confined to the inhabitants of Jerusalem or of Judæa. The religion of the Jews had become his abhorrence; as Daniel says of him, he had indignation against the holy covenant; and therefore, in order to put his wicked designs in execution against the Jews, wherever he might find them, he published a decree, enjoining all the nations subject to him to worship his gods: thus putting the whole of Syria under the operation of the decree; for he sought nothing less than, by compelling the whole nation to renounce their religion, to extinguish together with it their name and nation. It must be afflicting to every religiously-disposed person to consider how low must have been the state of true religion amongst the Samaritans at this time. As soon as they perceived what persecution had befallen the Jews on account of their adhering to the pure worship of God, they lost no time in making their peace with the king. In their petition to him, they excused themselves for their former observance of Jewish rites, on the ground that they had done so on account of some plagues which had infested their country: as was customary with them when the Jews were in affliction, they disclaimed all descent from the sons of Jacob, professing to belong to the Sidonian nation: they set forth their readiness to conform in all respects to the

Persecution of the Jews by Antiochus.

Conduct of the Samaritans.

B. C. 170. king's religion, and begged his permission to dedicate their temple on Mount Gerizim to the Grecian Jupiter. By these means they purchased their safety at the expense of their religion, and were not molested by the officers commissioned to put the king's decree into effect. Sad to relate, apostacy from the true God was not confined to the Samaritan nation. Many of the Jews sacrificed their principles of duty to motives of fear or of interest; seeking either to avoid the calamities of their country, or to secure to themselves the favour of the king. These apostate Jews proved the bitterest enemies of the faithful and persecuted Israelites, being more cruel than even the Syrians themselves; a line of conduct which, if their wishes did not encourage them to pursue, a presumed necessity compelled them to adopt as a testimony to the king's officers, of the sincerity of their apostacy from the religion of their fathers.

Dreadful state of the Jewish church.

As soon as the officers of Antiochus came to Jerusalem, every observance of the law of Moses ceased, the Sabbaths were profaned, the children were forbidden to be circumcised. Search was made for copies of the law, and as many as were found were destroyed, and any sort of disobedience to the king's commands met with no milder punishment than death. The light of the Jewish church was almost extinguished, the people were left without a priest to instruct them, and they dared not read for themselves, or perform even what they knew to be commanded. The Temple of the great God of heaven and earth was polluted by the worship of that impure fiction of the devil, the sensual god, the Olympian Jupiter. On that altar, from which had ascended for ages, the daily incense of those sacrifices which were typical of the one great sacrifice for the sins of mankind, the statue of the pagan god was erected, and a lesser altar built, whereon they sacrificed before the image which they had set up. We may easily judge with what cruelty they strove to propagate the tolerant religion of paganism, when we read of their taking two women who had circumcised their male children, and tying the children to their necks, casting both mother and infant together, headlong from the deepest part of the walls of the city; at the same time, putting to death all who had taken part in the administration of the rite. During this persecution, altars, groves, and idols, were everywhere erected. The Jews were forced to eat the flesh of swine and unclean beasts; festivals were celebrated in honour of Bacchus, in which the Jews were compelled to take an active and conspicuous part. Thus did God, in the wonderful dispensations of his providence, punish the Jews, by making their crimes the source and instrument of punishment. They had erred in admitting the practice of heathen customs and rites, contrary to the severe injunctions of the law of Moses, and to the revelation of God's displeasure which had been made to them by the prophets. They had patiently endured the commands of heathenish priests, and had allowed, without a murmur, the most sacred office in their church to be bought and sold, and possessed by men who used the authority as

the means of withdrawing the nation from the pure worship of Jehovah. They had willingly received the privilege of bringing up their youth in Grecian customs; they had left the services of the Temple to witness the sports and games of the gymnasium; and, therefore, it pleased God to deprive them of that power of worshipping him, which they had so carelessly neglected; and to compel them to accept, by force, the practice of those heathenish and idolatrous services, which they had seemed so much to desire. B. C. 170. Effects of the Divine retribution.

At the time when the officers of Antiochus came to Jerusalem to enforce his decree, there dwelt there a priest, named Mattathias, of the course of Joarib, an honourable man, and one who feared God. He had five sons, Johanan, Simon, Eleazar, Jonathan, and Judas, who was surnamed Maccabeus. To avoid the impending persecution, he retired with his family to Modin, a city in the tribe of Dan; thinking to remain hidden there, until the storm of desolation had passed over. But the severity of the persecution would not allow even so retired a town as Modin, to be a place of concealment for the family. One of the officers of Antiochus, named Apelles, soon arrived there, and immediately summoning the inhabitants together, informed them of the object of his mission. The example of Mattathias, he considered, would induce the people the more readily to comply with the king's commands; and, therefore, addressing himself first to him, he endeavoured to persuade him to submission, promising every honourable distinction that Antiochus could confer upon him and his family. Mattathias answered, with a loud voice, "Though all the nations that are under the king's dominion obey him, and fall away every one from the religion of their fathers, and give consent to his commandments, yet will I, and my sons, and my brethren, walk in the covenant of our fathers. God forbid that we should forsake the Law and the ordinances: we will not hearken to the king's word to go from our religion to the right hand or the left." Actions of Mattathias.

When he had thus spoken, he saw one of the Jews presenting himself to do sacrifice at the heathen altar, as the king had commanded, and with a holy zeal, like that of Phinehas, he fell upon the apostate and slew him; and, together with him, the king's commissioner and his attendants. Afterwards collecting all his family, and exciting all to follow him who were zealous for the Law, he fled from Modin, and retired to the mountains. His example was speedily followed by many, whereby the deserts of Judæa became filled with persons who sought refuge from the fury of the persecution. From this time began the war of the Maccabees. It was at first carried on by Mattathias, and after his death, which took place in a short time, by his son Judas, surnamed Maccabeus. This name is supposed to be derived from the initial letters of the Hebrew text—Mi Camoka Baelim Jehovah—Who is like unto thee among the Gods, O Jehovah; which being thus displayed on his standard, M.C.B.I., gave rise to the name Maccabee: and hence all who fought under that standard were

B. C. 168. War of the Maccabees.

called Maccabees, or Maccabeans; and as Judas and his brethren became distinguished as martyrs and confessors in the cause of religion, the name of Maccabees was in aftertimes applied, not only to those who assisted Judas, but also to others who in the time before these transactions, as well as subsequently, became conspicuous for their valiant resistance to persecution.

CHAPTER III.

THE ASAMONEAN PRINCES.

	Years.	B. C.
Judas Maccabeus	3	163
Iachim or Alcimus, High-priest	–	163
Jonathan	17	160
——— appointed High-priest	–	153
Simon	7	143
John Hyrcanus	30	136
Aristobulus I. and Antigonus	1	106
Alexander Jannæus	27	105
Q. Alexandra	9	78
Hyrcanus II.	3 M. –	69
Aristobulus II.	6 M. –	69
Hyrcanus II. again	23	63
Antigonus	3	40

Hales's Chronology, vol. ii.

FROM A. M. 3838, B. C. 166, to A. M. 3967, B. C. 37.
FROM THE 146TH TO THE 275TH YEAR OF THE SELEUCIDÆ, OR OF CONTRACTS.

A. M. 3838. B. C. 166.

THE reign of the Asamonean princes is a period of Jewish history peculiarly interesting, extending over a space of 129 years, which terminates in the thirty-seventh year before Christ. In the establishment of their power under Judas, Jonathan, and Simon, we see the reward of valour exerted in defence of religion and law, and the happy effects of family concord; whilst from the dissensions which prevailed amongst their descendants, and paved the way for the aggrandizement of the Herods, princes may learn the useful lesson that family feuds are more to be dreaded than even the rebellion of subjects; the one may for a time deprive the prince of power, the other wrests the sceptre from the family for ever.

General observations on this period.

The period which it is now our business to describe, abounding as it does with examples of public virtue, with incentives to patriotism, and with lessons of political prudence, is more strongly pressed upon our notice, on account of its close connection with the era of Christianity; for it was during the existence of the Asamonean power, that the influence of Rome extended itself to the internal affairs of Palestine. And he that believes the truth of prophecy, must be struck with admiration of the all-controlling power of Jehovah over the free agency of men, when he sees the Jewish nation courting protection from the Roman Senate, and in the assistance afforded by them to the con-

B. C. 166. quest of Egypt by Julius Cæsar, even aiding the establishment of that Imperial power, by which eventually their Temple and city were reduced to ashes, and the prophecies of Christ himself most accurately fulfilled.

The demoralization of a nation is not the work of a single age; and therefore if we would trace the causes which produced the universal corruption of manners, the unbounded licentiousness, and the gross ignorance of the nature of the Mosaic covenant, which prevailed amongst the Jews at the time of our Lord's appearance, we must not confine our observations to the reign of the Herods, but we must look for the rise of these evils, if not in the early part, at least in the latter years of the Asamonean princes.

Origin of the Asamonean power.

The Asamonean family[1] being descended from Mattathias, the son of John, the son of Simeon, the son of Asamoneus, a priest of the course of Joarib, united in their own persons the civil and ecclesiastical authority.

Conduct of Mattathias.

The fame of Mattathias, the father of Judas Maccabeus, is almost eclipsed by the successful valour of his son; but we must not forget that Mattathias laid the foundation of the authority of his descendants in that resistance to the persecutions of Antiochus, which in his own person he so fearlessly displayed. A time of persecution is always one of anarchy; the laws of nature and of religion can never be publicly violated without destroying the force of all human laws, and weakening those ties of duty which bind men to abstain from the commission of injury. The retirement, therefore, of Mattathias into the mountains of Judæa, afforded to his followers the double blessing of an escape from the fury of Antiochus, and an enjoyment of a pure administration of the Law. To this allusion is made (1 *Macc.* ii. 29), "Many that sought after justice and judgment went down into the wilderness to dwell there, both they and their children, and their wives and their cattle, because afflictions increased sore upon them." And we may easily conceive how powerfully the desire of preservation from private injustice would operate, in aid of a firm attachment to the law of Moses, to unite men under so wise and brave a chief as Mattathias.

In persons so circumstanced it would not be surprising to find something of superstitious enthusiasm. A party of Jews, to the number of one thousand, having retired to the wilderness, were pursued by the army of Antiochus, and being overtaken on the Sabbath-day, were so far from resisting their enemies, that they did not even take those measures of defence against attack, which the strength of their position afforded; but patiently submitted to destruction, rather than to the guilt, as they conceived, of violating the sacred rest of the Sabbath. Some of the party escaping, brought intelligence of this dreadful event to Mattathias and his friends; who considering what evil consequences would ensue from this practice, determined to establish a law allowing resistance to be made on the Sabbath[2] against the attack of an enemy;

[1] Josepnus, *Antiq.*, xii. 534.—Hudson. [2] 1 *Macc.* ii. 40.

a mitigation of the severity of the Mosaic law, sanctioned not less by motives of prudence, than by the dictates of nature. Mattathias soon found himself strong enough to attempt publicly the restoration of religion. The altars erected for heathen sacrifices he everywhere pulled down; the apostates he put to death, but many took refuge among the neighbouring nations; he strictly enjoined the due administration of circumcision, being now able to rid the country of the officers commissioned to prevent the exercise of the rites of the Mosaic law. The extent of his success is thus described (1 *Macc.* ii. 48): "So they recovered the Law out of the hand of the Gentiles, and out of the hand of kings, neither suffered they the sinner to triumph." B. C. 166

The good old man did not long witness the happy results of his piety and patriotism. In the first year after the commencement of the war he died; having lived to witness the defeat of Antiochus's wicked designs for the destruction of the true religion, and leaving to his sons an example of courage and self-devotion, which served to animate them during the perils they were afterwards called to encounter. In 1 *Macc.* ii. Mattathias is represented addressing them on his death-bed, in words worthy the pen of inspiration. We shall therefore insert the address at full length:—"Now when the time drew near that Mattathias should die, he said unto his sons, 'Now hath pride and rebuke gotten strength, and the time of destruction, and the wrath of indignation. Now, therefore, my sons, be ye zealous for the Law, and give your lives for the covenant of your fathers. Call to your remembrance what acts our fathers did in their times; so shall ye receive great honour and an everlasting name. Was not Abraham found faithful in temptation, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness? Joseph, in the time of his distress, kept the commandment, and was made lord of Egypt. Phinees, our father, in being zealous and fervent, obtained the covenant of an everlasting Priesthood. Jesus, for fulfilling the word, was made a judge in Israel. Caleb, for bearing witness for the congregation, received the heritage of the land. David, for being merciful, possessed the throne of an everlasting kingdom. Elias, for being zealous and fervent for the Law, was taken up into heaven. Ananias, Azarias, and Misael, by believing, were saved out of the flame. Daniel, for his innocency, was delivered from the mouth of the lions. And thus consider ye, throughout all ages, that none that put their trust in Him shall be overcome. Fear not, then, the words of a sinful man; for his glory shall be dung and worms. To-day he shall be lifted up, and to morrow he shall not be found, because he is returned into his dust, and his thought is come to nothing. Wherefore, ye, my sons, be valiant, and show yourselves men in behalf of the Law; for by it ye shall obtain glory. And, behold, I know that your brother Simon is a man of counsel, give ear unto him alway: he shall be a father unto you. As for Judas Maccabeus, he hath been mighty and strong even from his youth up: let him be your captain, and fight the battle of the people. Take also unto you all those that observe the

Mattathias dies.

His death-bed address.

B. C. 166. Law, and avenge ye the wrong of your people. Recompense fully the heathen, and take heed to the commandments of the Law.' So he blessed them, and was gathered to his fathers."[1] The curious reader will find it worth while to compare with this passage the corresponding oration of Josephus (*Ant.* lib. xii. c. 6), in which the historian, probably considering that the references made by Mattathias to the various passages of sacred history would be less interesting to his heathen readers, has given to the oration of Mattathias a form corresponding to that commonly used by the Greek and Roman historians: the sentiments are also less peculiarly Jewish, and might not be unsuitable to the dying exhortations of a heathen patriot.

JUDAS MACCABEUS.

B. C. 166. Judas succeeds his father.

On the death of his father, Judas, surnamed Maccabeus, succeeded to the chief command among his religious countrymen. In the list of the five sons of Mattathias, he is placed the third; but Josephus expressly mentions him as the eldest son.[2] It is probable that though Mattathias had the chief direction of affairs, so long as he lived, yet that, during the confusion which prevailed, he was not acknowledged formally as the leader of the nation; but his son Judas being publicly declared the captain of the nation, to him is therefore ascribed the honour of being the first of the Asamonean race of princes.

His character.

In the person of Judas Maccabeus, we discern one of those extraordinary characters whom Providence raises up in times of emergency for the accomplishment of some important object. Possessed of great personal courage, and of a mind capable of resisting every impression of danger, he united with this natural virtue, the skill and prudence of an experienced master in the art of war: his army was regularly disciplined (1 *Macc.* iii. 56) and divided into that large number of superior and subordinate commands, which gives every advantage of unity of action, and ensures to each part of the army mutual support. If we examine the nature of the campaigns he carried on, we shall find them not consisting of desultory warfare against the enemy, but of deliberate schemes of resistance, put into effect with every consideration of the advantage which a small body of men may possess over an invading army in the choice of place and time of attack. During the first two years of his command, he defeated the generals of Antiochus, Apollonius, Seron, and Lysias, in four several engagements; and finding that his successes had served to deter the king from any immediate renewal of the contest, he led his victorious army to Jerusalem for the purpose of clearing and dedicating the Sanctuary; a work which could not be accomplished without some difficulty, the Temple being commanded by the fortress on Mount Acra, which was still garrisoned

His warfare.

Defeats the generals of Antiochus sent against him.

[1] 1 *Macc.* ii. [2] *De Bell. Jud.*, i. 959.

by the heathen. By his command a new altar was built to supply the place of that which had been profaned; the Temple was furnished anew with vessels; the candlestick, the altar of incense, the table for the shew-bread were again set in their places; the bread was set in order, and the veils were hung up which divided the Holy of Holies from the Holy Place. On the twenty-fifth day of the month Casleu, the very day on which three years before Antiochus had polluted the altar with heathen sacrifices, and three years and a half subsequent to the desolation of the city and Temple by Apollonius, did Judas and his countrymen keep the feast of dedication with songs of joy and gladness; the feast was kept for eight days; and it was ordained to be observed by the congregation for ever. This festival happens in the former part of our month of December. Our Saviour is related by St. John (chap. x. 22) to have honoured it with his presence; thus testifying his compliance even with those ordinances which were of mere human authority. By Josephus this feast is called the feast of lights (Candlemas), a custom prevailing amongst the Jews of illuminating the doors of their houses with candles during every night of the feast. By the dedication of the Temple under Judas Maccabeus was fulfilled most accurately the prophecy given by Daniel respecting the period of its desolation; which he foretold should continue for three years and a half, or in the language of the prophecy, a time, times, and half a time, it being exactly, as has been related, three years and a half from the desolation of the Temple by Apollonius to the rededication of it by Judas. The hill, Moriah, upon which the Temple was built, being somewhat lower than the neighbouring hill, Acra, which had been fortified by Apollonius, and was still possessed by the partisans of Antiochus, the people were much annoyed in their way to the Temple by the attacks of the garrison. The first care of Judas, therefore, was to surround the mountain of the Lord's house with walls and towers, and to place in it a detachment of his army for the protection of those who came thither to worship. In after times, under the Asamonean reign, the valley between Moriah and Acra was filled up, and the height of the latter hill lowered, so that the buildings of the Temple overhung those on Mount Acra.[1]

B. C. 166. Dedicates anew the Temple. Feast of dedication. Prophecy of Daniel, xii. 7, fulfilled. B. C. 165. The Temple fortified.

The Idumeans, being now in hostility against the Jews, Judas took the precaution of fortifying Bethsura, a town situated between Jerusalem and Hebron, making it thereby the southern barrier of the country. The exact position of this place is not known: its name implies that it stood on an eminence, and it is probable that it commanded one of the defiles in the south, or hill country (as St. Luke terms it) of Judæa. The prosperity of Judas excited the envy and hatred of the neighbouring nations, and they formed a league for the utter extirpation of the Jewish nation. Many Jews who were sojourning amongst them they cruelly put to death; but the design of the league was defeated by the sudden

Bethsura fortified. B. C. 164.

[1] *De Bell. Jud.*, v. 1222.

B. C. 164. death of Antiochus. The tyrant was on his road to Babylon when news was brought him of the entire defeat of his generals, of the re-dedication of the Temple, and the abolition of the altars of his gods.[1] Enraged at this frustration of his impious designs, he hastened his journey to Judæa, vowing vengeance upon the whole nation of the Jews, and threatening to make Jerusalem their grave; but whilst on his way thither, the stroke of death overtook him, and he died, as other persecutors have done, in the most dreadful agonies of body and soul, conscious that the hand of God was upon him, to revenge the impiety and cruelty of his attempts to destroy His chosen people.

League against the Jews defeated by the death of Antiochus Epiphanes.

Campaign of Judas against the neighbouring nations.

Intelligence being brought to Judas of the confederacy formed against his countrymen by the neighbouring people, he commenced a campaign against them which was crowned with wonderful success. At Acrabattene, a city of Idumea, he slew twenty thousand men. The Children of Bean, a tribe of the Edomites,[2] he defeated in battle, besieged and took their fortresses, and put the garrisons to death; and when some of the captives escaped by bribing the soldiers, he did not allow such violation of military discipline to pass unnoticed, but publicly convicted the guilty, and inflicted on them the penalty of death. Judas having also made an incursion into the land of the Ammonites beyond Jordan, Timotheus, the Syrian governor, collected all his forces[3] against him, to avenge the insult thus offered to his province; but he was entirely defeated, and afterwards slain at the taking of Gazara, whither he had fled for refuge. The nations which surrounded Judæa were struck with amazement at the victories of Judas; and the inhabitants of Tyre, Sidon, Ptolemais, and Gilead immediately began an active war against him. It required every exertion to enable him to withstand the enemies by whom he was encircled. He divided the Jewish armies into three parts:[4] with the first, he himself went to the relief of his countrymen in the land of Gilead; the second was entrusted to Simon, for the defence of those resident in Galilee, the third division was left at home for the protection of Jerusalem and Judæa. Such determined valour met with its reward; Judas quickly overran the country of Gilead, took several towns, and returned to Jerusalem laden with spoils. Simon was scarcely less successful in the defeat of the enemy at Galilee; but finding the number of Jews there so small as to be incapable of defending themselves in the possession of the country, he deemed it the wisest policy to withdraw them from it, and by settling them in the land of Judæa, to restore to the population the strength it had lost during the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes. The party which remained at home, acting in disobedience to the orders which they had received, occasioned some disasters, which threw a damp upon the general joy. Joseph and Azarias, who commanded this division, eagerly desiring to share the fame of the other generals, led forth their forces on an expe-

His vigorous prosecution of the war.

Simon withdraws the Jews from Galilee to dwell in Judæa.

[1] 1 *Macc.* 6. 2 *Macc.* 6.
[2] 1 *Macc.* 5. 2 *Macc.* 10.
[3] 2 *Macc.* x. 24.
[4] 1 *Macc.* v.

dition against Jamnia, a seaport town on the Mediterranean; but Gorgias, the governor of that district, fell upon them, and defeated them with a loss of two thousand men. This misfortune, however, did not prevent the fame of Judas and his brethren from extending itself to the nations beyond the confines of Judæa. B.C. 164. Disastrous enterprise of Joseph against Jamnia.

Judas was now called upon once more to resist the attack of his principal enemy. Lysias, the guardian and kinsman of Antiochus Eupator, the son and successor of Epiphanes, indignant at the insult his countrymen had received in the successes of Maccabeus, collected an army of eighty thousand men, and eighty elephants, with which he advanced to the invasion of Judea.[1] The entire conquest of the country, and the plunder of the Temple, were the objects of the expedition. And here the wisdom and foresight of Judas in fortifying Bethsura was conspicuously displayed. After Lysias had sat down before this important fortress, which checked his advance into the interior of Judæa, a well-planned attack made by Judas not only relieved the garrison from the siege, but ended in the dispersion of the invading army. Whereupon Lysias, weary of so unprosperous a war, made a peace with Judas, which was ratified by Antiochus. It is stated that on this occasion the Jewish nation was benefited by the friendly offices of Q. Memmius and T. Manlius, who were at that time ambassadors from the Romans to the court of Antiochus Eupator. By this peace, the decree of Antiochus Epiphanes against the practice of the religion of the Jews was rescinded, and free liberty was granted them to live under the dominion of their own laws. Under so weak a government as that of Antiochus Eupator, a treaty made by the king would have little power to check the border warfare, which the surrounding nations perpetually carried on against the Jews. As soon as Lysias had retired to Antioch, Judas was again called out to avenge the murder of the Jews at Joppa and Jamnia,[2] and to assist those in Gilead against Timotheus. The expedition terminated in the entire overthrow of the army of Timotheus at Raphon,[3] on the river Jabbok; and in the farther practice of the policy before adopted of withdrawing those Jews, who lived among the heathen, and settling them within the confines of Judæa. The army returned from this exploit about the time of Pentecost. After the observance of the festival, Judas again made war against Gorgias and the Idumeans: the victory was achieved with difficulty and not without loss. Upon stripping the bodies of the dead, for the purpose of burial, Judas discovered that many of his soldiers wore about them such ornaments, dedicated to the heathen idols,[4] as had been taken amongst the spoils of war. The death of so many brave men was not without reason accepted as a punishment inflicted on them for this sin of idolatry. A collection was therefore made throughout the camp to the amount of two thousand drachmæ, which was sent to Jerusalem to provide sin offerings; and prayers were made publicly in the camp, that their sin might not be visited on

Attack of Lysias upon Judæa.

Defence of Bethsura.

Peace made with Antiochus.

Friendly interference of the Roman ambassadors.

Judas carries on a border war.

Traces of idolatrous superstition amongst Judas's soldiers.

[1] 2 *Macc.* ii. [2] 2 *Macc.* xii. [3] 1 *Macc* v. [4] 2 *Macc.* xii.

B.C. 164. them in the destruction of the nation. Judas did not, however, stop from pushing his success to the utmost: he besieged Hebron, the capital of Idumea, and extending his march into the country of the Philistines, plundered their cities, and brought back the spoils in triumph to Jerusalem. This was now considered a favourable opportunity to attempt the reduction of the fort of Acra, which was still held by the Syrians, who were continually sallying out, and disturbing the peace of the city and the service of the Temple. The siege was commenced with the greatest vigour by the Jews, who employed every method of assault against the fort. Some apostate Jews, who formed part of the garrison, well aware that no mercy would be extended to them, should they be forced to yield, contrived to effect their escape, and coming with all speed to Antioch, informed the king of the danger with which the fortress was threatened. Upon the receipt of this intelligence, which foreboded the entire loss of the city of Jerusalem, a vast army, consisting of a hundred and twenty thousand men, with thirty-two elephants, and three hundred chariots, was instantly put in motion for the relief of the fort.[1] The king, accompanied by his guardian Lysias, marched with them in person.

He attempts to reduce the fort of Acra.

War resumed by the king.

B.C. 163. The operations commenced with the siege of Bethsura. The fear of losing this important post, proved a most powerful means of diverting Judas from pressing the siege of Acra: he flew to the relief of Bethsura, and falling upon the enemy by night, slew four thousand, and effected his retreat in order. At break of day both parties prepared for action. Judas and his followers fought with the most determined bravery, but seeing that his army was too small effectually to resist the overpowering forces of the enemy, he withdrew from the battle, and retreated in safety to Jerusalem. In this battle Eleazar,[2] the brother of Judas, fell a victim to his spirit of self-devotion. Perceiving that one of the elephants was of greater size than the rest, and covered with royal trappings, and concluding that the king himself was probably upon it, and might perish on the fall of the beast, he cut his way through the thickest of the fight, and creeping under the belly of the elephant, thrust in his spear and slew him; the beast fell upon him, and crushed him to death. The siege of Bethsura was then renewed by the Syrian army. The garrison defended themselves with valour; but their provisions failing, they were compelled to surrender the fort, which they did upon honourable terms.[3] According to Josephus, and the calculation of Dr. Hales,[4] the year was a Sabbatical year, which circumstance will account for the scarcity of provision, which led to the surrender of Bethsura; and, but for the interference of Providence, would have again brought the Temple under the power of Antiochus. For the Syrian army, marching to Jerusalem from the capture of Bethsura, besieged the sanctuary, and when those within were almost reduced to the necessity of yielding,

Courage of Eleazar.

Bethsura lost.

B.C. 163.

Jerusalem besieged, and capitulates.

[1] 2 *Macc.* xiii. [2] 1 *Macc.* vi. [3] *Antiq.* lib. xii. p. 546.
[4] Vol. ii. p. 606.

on account of the like failure of provision, they were relieved, intelli- B. C. 163.
gence having been received by Lysias that Philip, whom Antiochus Epiphanes had appointed guardian of his son, had seized Antioch, and taken upon him the government of the empire. Lysias, therefore, found it necessary to make peace with the Jews. The conditions were advantageous, and Antiochus swore to observe them; but on being admitted into the sanctuary, and observing the strength of the fortifications, he ordered them to be demolished, and, having thus violated the treaty which he had made, he departed from Jerusalem. The articles of capitulation violated.

We have now to record one of those well-merited acts of retribution, which iniquity even in this world so frequently suffers. Throughout the whole time of the persecution by Antiochus Epiphanes down to this year, Menelaus, the impious apostate, had borne the title of High-priest. No account is given of his conduct or his place of residence during the war of the Maccabees: but on the last advance of Lysias against Jerusalem, he seems to have left his hiding-place,[1] and once more to have acted a part on the stage of public affairs. We are told, that on this occasion, "he joined himself with the Syrians, and with the greatest dissimulation encouraged Antiochus, not for the safeguard of the country, but because he thought to have been made governor. But the King of Kings moved Antiochus's mind against this wicked wretch; and Lysias informed the king that this man was the cause of all the mischief, so that the king commanded to bring him unto Berrhœa, and to put him to death, as the manner is in that place. Now there was in that place a tower of fifty cubits high, full of ashes, and it had a round instrument, which on every side hanged down in the ashes. And whosoever was condemned of sacrilege, or had committed any other grievous crime, there did all men thrust him unto death. Such a death it happened that wicked man to die, not having so much as burial in the earth; and that most justly: for inasmuch as he had committed many sins about the altar, whose fire and and ashes were holy, he received his death in ashes." Thus died Menelaus, a memorable example of God's vengeance, and a remarkable instance of a wicked man meeting with his deserts from the hands of those to whom he looked for honour and distinction as the recompense of devotion to their interests. Conduct and end of Menelaus.

By the treaty concluded with Antiochus at the capitulation of the Temple, Judas was appointed governor of Judæa, under the king. From this year the date of the Asamonean dynasty ought in propriety to be reckoned: for, until the acknowledgment of the authority of Judas by the above-mentioned treaty,[2] we cannot consider him in any other light than as the leader of a religious insurrection: an insurrection in which it became every lover of God and the true religion to bear his part. And though it is customary to assign the commencement of the government of Judas to the first year (B. C. 166) in which the Jews fought for religion under his standard, it would be more correct to Real commencement of the reign of Judas.

[1] 2 *Macc* xiii 3.

[2] *Antiq.* lib. xiv. p. 659.

B.C. 163. follow, in this instance, the authority of Josephus, who assigns to this dynasty a duration of only a hundred and twenty-six years, which must be reckoned from B. C. 163. We have, therefore, no longer to consider Judas as a leader, whose only right to dominion is gained by the sword, but as the regularly constituted governor over the land of Judæa.

Alcimus made High-priest.

On the death of Menelaus, Alcimus, or Jacimus, was appointed High-priest, to the exclusion of the rightful successor Onias, the son of that Onias who was slain at Antioch by the instigation of his wicked brother Menelaus.[1] Onias hereupon retired in disgust to Egypt,[2] not without hope of diminishing the authority of the Temple at Jerusalem. For this purpose he obtained permission from Ptolemy Philometor to build a Temple at Heliopolis, and thus two rivals existed against Jerusalem, the Temple at Gerizim, and the Temple of Onias. The Rabbinical writers reckon the number of Jews resident in Egypt under the Temple of Onias, at twice the number of those who came up from Egypt with Moses. From them it appears that the same sacrifices, rites, and ceremonies prevailed there as in the Temple at Jerusalem, and continued to be observed until its destruction by Vespasian, a short time prior to the ruin of that Temple itself.

Onias, thus excluded, retires to Egypt and builds a Temple.

Alcimus accuses Judas of not being received by the Jews.

To return to our history. Alcimus, on account of his profligacy and attachment to the heathenish rites, was not long permitted by the people to exercise his office; but when Demetrius, the son of Seleucus Philopator, dispossessing Antiochus Eupator, had succeeded to the kingdom, Alcimus, desirous of recovering his authority, accused Judas and his friends of hostility to the king's party; by which the king was induced to reinstate Alcimus, and sent Bacchides, the governor of Mesopotamia, with a force for that purpose. Alcimus in vain endea-

B. C. 162. voured by deceitful proposals[3] to entrap Judas and his followers. As many, however, as sixty Assidæans fell into the snare: for foolishly concluding that a priest of the house of Aaron would do them no wrong, they first were willing to enter into negotiation for peace, but Bacchides having got them in his power, put them to death. Bacchides then left the country to the care of Alcimus, having provided him with a force sufficient for his support. But the conduct of the High-priest did not allow Judas to yield to him a quiet submission. Alcimus being, therefore, again expelled, made his complaint to Demetrius, whereupon the king sent Nicanor with a great army to destroy Judas. This force was twice signally defeated by the valour of Judas and his followers, and in the second action Nicanor was slain. The victory was gained on the thirtieth day of the month Adar, and a yearly festival was kept in remembrance of the deliverance.

nterference of the Romans in behalf of Judas.

This year is remarkable for the formation of the first treaty of alliance between the Romans and the Jews. Judas Maccabeus seeing how little dependence could be placed on the kings of Syria for the preservation of religion, and having heard of the power and influence

[1] *Antiq.* lib. xii. p. 547.

[2] Jos. *de Bell.* 7, 10, and *Antiq.* lib. xii. p. 547.

[3] 1 *Macc.* vii.

of the Romans, and of the conquests they had made in Africa, Greece, and Asia, determined, if possible, to form an alliance with them.[1] He therefore sent two of his friends to Rome for this purpose, to conclude a treaty with the Senate, and to seek their interference with Demetrius in favour of the Jews. The Romans, ever ready to grant favours which reduced the power of foreign princes and increased their own, decreed that the Jews should be received into the number of their friends and allies.[2] And they wrote a letter to Demetrius, requiring him no longer to harass or disturb that nation, now taken under their protection: but before the delivery of the letter, on the return of the ambassadors, Judas was dead. He died as he had lived, in arms, fighting in defence of religion and liberty; for Demetrius, on the defeat of Nicanor, had sent Bacchides with Alcimus a second time into Judæa, at the head of the flower of his army. Judas had no more than three thousand men to oppose this great force;[3] and all of these, except eight hundred, fled panic-struck at the strength and number of the enemy. With this handful of men, the brave and intrepid leader ventured to engage the whole army of Demetrius. The impetuosity of his attack put the right wing of the enemy to flight, and he pursued them to a great distance; but the left wing was still entire: it was impossible to resist the fresh attack of such superior numbers; Judas was slain, and having lost their leader, the army fled. A truce was then concluded. Jonathan and Simon, his brothers, took up his body and buried him in the sepulchre of his fathers at Modin; all the faithful in Judah and Jerusalem making great lamentation over him, and saying, "How is the valiant fallen that delivered Israel!" B.C. 162. Death of Judas.

We have throughout the foregoing transactions seen Judas Maccabeus acting the part of a brave and a generous leader, living as it were in the field, and keeping up a series of warfare, almost without an interval of peace, for the space of six years. In the catalogues of High-priests in the Temple at Jerusalem, we commonly find the name of Judas inserted; though neither in the books of Maccabees, nor in the history of Josephus, do we find any account of his discharging the duties of that station. The mistake has arisen from an error committed by Josephus himself,[4] who relating the death of Alcimus, which did not take place until one year after the death of Judas, adds, that the people then gave the chief priesthood to Judas.[5] The historian subsequently, in his regular catalogue of the High-priests, corrects the error into which he had, perhaps inadvertently, fallen; and distinctly states, that Alcimus dying after having filled that office three years, no successor was appointed, and that the office was vacant for the space of seven years, when Jonathan, the brother of Maccabeus, and his successor in the civil authority, was created High-priest. That so important an office should have been allowed to remain vacant so Judas never High-priest.

[1] 1 *Macc.* viii. [2] Justin, lib. xxxvi. c. 3. [3] 1 *Macc.* ix.
[4] *Antiq.* lib. xii. p. 550. [5] Ibid. lib. xx. 900.

B.C. 162. long is certainly a remarkable occurrence: it can only be accounted for under the supposition, that Judas and his brother Jonathan purposely abstained from any the least appearance of illegal usurpation of power; and that they took upon themselves no office but such as necessity compelled them to exercise in defence of their religion and their lives. The governorship of the country seems to have been received as a boon by Judas from Antiochus;[1] and the account which is given of the readiness with which Jonathan accepted the priesthood from the hands of Alexander Balas, clearly proves the opinion then entertained of the power possessed by the sovereign lord of the country to appoint a successor to that office. We may farther observe, that the disinterested conduct of these two brothers, in not assuming to themselves more power than the immediate necessity of their situation required, must have contributed in a very great degree to the preservation of their influence amongst their countrymen.

JONATHAN.

The apostate party revives.

The death of Judas proved a source of infinite calamity to his followers. The apostate party, no longer awed into submission by his power, took advantage of this event to reinstate themselves in the possession of the country. A famine also happening at this unfavourable juncture, aided their designs, by the revolts and disorders which want produced amongst the lower orders. Alcimus and his party now reigned without opposition: every office of authority was possessed by them; and not content with exercising the power which they had thus acquired over the administration of justice, they proceeded openly to persecute even to death as many of the followers of Judas as they could get into their hands. Search was everywhere made for the Maccabeans, who were brought before Bacchides, cruelly tortured, and put to death.[2] There was great affliction in Israel, the like whereof was not since the time that a prophet was not seen among them, i. e. since the death of Malachi. Bitter must have been the severity of Bacchides, since the miseries inflicted by him upon the faithful Jews surpassed those which they endured under the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes. Such circumstances naturally called forth a successor to Judas, in his brother Jonathan: the people, choosing him for their captain, and committing themselves to his guidance. Jonathan used every exertion to collect forces to oppose Bacchides; but finding his person endangered by the diligent endeavours made by Bacchides to seize him, he retired with his brother Simon to the wilderness of Thekon, and there encamped in a strong position upon the river Jordan.[3] Their goods, and such property as was likely to be lost in the contest, they entrusted to the care of their brother John, that he might remove them into the country of the

Alcimus in power.

Dreadful persecution.

Jonathan chosen leader.

[1] 1 *Macc.* x. [2] 1 *Macc.* ix. 27. *Antiq.* lib. xiii. p. 555.
[3] 1 *Macc.* ix.

Nabathæans. On his way thither John was attacked by a party of Arabs of the tribe of Jambria, who slew him and carried off the baggage as their booty; but this enterprise soon after converted a day of joy amongst the Jambrians into one of mourning and sorrow; for Jonathan and Simon having received intelligence of a grand bridal procession that was to take place on the marriage of one of the Jambrian chiefs to a daughter of a Canaanitish nobleman, lay in ambush amongst the mountains, and, falling upon the company, slew nearly all of them, and taking with them the spoil, returned to the camp, having powerfully revenged the death of their brother. Tidings of this event being brought to Bacchides, he immediately marched against Jonathan and Simon, and assaulted their camp on the Sabbath-day. The Syrian governor met with a resistance he little expected, considering the sanctity attached to the Sabbath of the Jews; for Jonathan exhorting his men to remember the determination made in the time of Mattathias upon this point, they valiantly resisted the attack, and slew a thousand of the enemy; but finding their numbers unequal to the contest, they threw themselves into the river Jordan, and swimming over to the other side, escaped. Bacchides returned to Jerusalem, and gave orders for fortifying all the strong places in Judæa, and especially the fort of Acra, at Jerusalem, which he provided with all kinds of stores; and taking the children of the chief men of the country, kept them there as hostages for the fidelity of their parents.

B.C. 162.

Bacchides the governor repulsed by Jonathan.

Alcimus was still in full possession of the authority of the High-priesthood; but it pleased God to deliver Israel from any farther trouble at the hands of this man. It happened that whilst he was giving orders for the removal of a low wall, called the Chel, which had been built for the purpose of separating the court of the women from the court of the Gentiles, he was struck with the palsy and died. On the death of Alcimus, Bacchides returned to Antioch, and the Jews suffered no further molestation from the Syrians for the space of two years. It is probable that this blessing of peace resulted from the interference of the Roman Senate; and that orders had come by this time to Demetrius, no longer to trouble the Jews, now admitted into alliance with Rome. To this circumstance we may also refer the vacancy of the High-priesthood after the death of Alcimus; Demetrius not caring to nominate a successor, whom he could not support in the office, without being liable to incur the displeasure of the Romans, should resistance be made to the appointment by Jonathan and his followers. We may, therefore, now consider Judæa for a time left entirely to his government.

Death of Alcimus.

Bacchides retires from Judæa.

For two years Jonathan and his friends dwelt at peace; but at the end of this time Bacchides being informed by the adverse party, that all their enemies might be seized in a single night, came into Judæa for the purpose of putting such a plan into execution. The plot was happily discovered by Jonathan, who seized fifty of the conspirators

Bacchides plots against Jonathan.

B. C. 158. and put them to death. His forces not being able to cope with the army of Bacchides, Jonathan retired to Bethbasi, in the wilderness,
B. C. 156. which he fortified, and in it successfully withstood a siege. Bacchides, enraged at this defeat, slew those advisers who had brought him back into Judæa, and making peace with Jonathan, exchanged prisoners, and swore that he would never more return to molest the land. The war was now at an end. Jonathan settled in peace at Michmash, about
B. C. 153. nine miles north of Jerusalem, where he administered the laws, and pursued his reformation by destroying those who had apostatized from the true religion.

In this year arose that famous impostor Alexander Balas, and set up his claim to the kingdom of Syria. Under the protection of the Roman Senate, he raised forces, and sailing to Ptolemais, in Palestine, seized the city and proclaimed himself king of Syria. Demetrius was therefore called upon to adopt every measure of defence in his power. The disputes between these two competitors proved of infinite advantage to Jonathan,[1] both parties vying with each other in offers to secure his co-operation. Demetrius appointed him the king's general in Judæa, and sent him letters commanding that all the hostages seized by Bacchides, should be delivered up to him. Compliance with these orders so strengthened the force of Jonathan and the number of his adherents, that all the garrisons in the country, excepting those at Bethsura and at the fort of Acra, left their stations and fled. The apostate Jews, fearing the punishment that must await them if they were taken, still kept the two forts last mentioned. Jonathan now removed to Jerusalem, repaired and fortified the city, and rebuilt the wall round the mountain of the Temple, which Antiochus Eupator had pulled down in violation of the treaty. On the other hand, Alexander, hearing what Demetrius had done, made also a proposal to Jonathan, granting to him the High-priesthood and the title of king's friend: he sent him also a purple robe and a crown of gold, in testimony of this grant. In the seventh month of this year, at the feast of tabernacles, Jonathan put on his robes as High-priest,[2] after that office had been vacant seven years from the death of Alcimus. Demetrius now strove to outbid Alexander, and offered to Jonathan the following immunities and rewards: a release from tributes, customs on salt, and crown taxes; the additions of the three government of Ophrema, Lydda, and Ramathem in Samaria, and the government of Galilee, to that of Judæa; the freedom of the holy city; exemption from tenths and tributes; the restoration of all captives that had been carried out of the land of Judæa, from all parts of the kingdom of Syria, with remission of their tribute, and even of their cattle; immunity and toleration for all the Jews within the realm to celebrate their festivals, sabbaths, new moons, and solemn days, without molestation or hinderance: and in return he required an enrolment of thirty thousand Jews, to be paid by the crown, and to serve in the garrisons and places of trust, with

Benefits awarded to Jonathan from the designs of Alexander Balas.

Made High priest. B. C. 153.

[1] *Antiq.* lib. xiii. p. 559. [2] 1 *Macc.* x.

liberty to live according to their own laws. He offered also the seaport of Ptolemais, in Palestine, with its territory, as a free gift to the Temple of Jerusalem, for its necessary expenses; and a remission of the five thousand shekels of silver, which had been annually paid out of the revenues of the Temple, and which belonged to the officiating priests; to make the Temple an asylum for debtors to the king; and to pay the expenses of repairing and fortifying Jerusalem and the Temple Mount out of the king's treasury. The grant is contained in the first book of Maccabees,[1] and it is curious inasmuch as it demonstrates the extent of the oppressions practised by the Syrian government, and furnishes a sufficient justification for Jonathan's rejection of such proposals from the insincere Demetrius, and his preference of an alliance with Alexander.

B.C. 153. Terms offered by Demetrius to gain Jonathan.

In the contest between Demetrius and Alexander, the latter, supported by the Romans, was eventually successful; and having now become master of the Syrian empire, he formed an alliance in marriage with Cleopatra, the daughter of Ptolemy, king of Egypt. The marriage was celebrated in the city of Ptolemais. Jonathan was invited to the wedding, and was received by Alexander with every mark of distinction, being clothed in purple, and admitted to the chief place among the king's friends; and when many had come thither to make accusations against Jonathan, Alexander caused it to be proclaimed in the city that none should speak evil of him: thus honoured, Jonathan returned to Jerusalem.[2]

B.C. 150. Jonathan honoured by Ptolemy.

Demetrius, the son of that Demetrius whom Alexander Balas had dispossessed, now asserted his right to the crown of Syria. Apollonius, the governor of Cœle-Syria under Alexander, taking part with Demetrius, first attempted to reduce Jonathan, who remained firm to the interests of Alexander, and encamping at Jamnia, he challenged Jonathan to the contest. Jonathan marched from Jerusalem with ten thousand men, and took Joppa in the sight of Apollonius's army; and then engaging with the enemy put them to flight, and pursued them to Azotus, which city he burnt, together with the temple of Diana. In requital of this service, Alexander sent to Jonathan a buckle of gold, such as was worn only by the royal family, and gave him also the city of Ekron with its territory.

B.C. 148. Alexander acknowledges the services of Jonathan.

Jonathan being now in quiet possession of Judæa, determined to make every attempt to reduce the garrison in the fort of Acra, and accordingly commenced a regular siege. Demetrius Nicator had just succeeded to the throne of Syria. The garrison conveyed intelligence of the attack of Jonathan to the king, who forthwith came to Ptolemais, and summoned Jonathan to appear there before him.[3] This transaction well displayed the firmness and the policy of Jonathan. He still gave further orders to press the siege, but went to Ptolemais, taking with him many valuable presents, for he was well aware of the force such arguments possess in a debauched and

B.C. 145. Jonathan attempts the reduction of the fort of Acra.

[1] Ch. x. v. 29. [2] 1 *Macc.* x. [3] 1 *Macc.* xi.

B. C. 145. licentious court. Demetrius, in return, refused to listen to the accusation, confirmed him in the High-priest's office,[1] and admitted him to the number of his friends, and ratified all the offers which his father had formerly made to secure this friendship. The fort still holding out, Demetrius was urged to withdraw the garrison. At this time the city of Antioch was in a state of tumult, and Demetrius promised compliance with Jonathan's request, provided he would send him assistance against the mutineers. Three thousand men were despatched to his aid, and by their help the Antiochians were defeated in their conspiracy against the king. The Jews plundered the city, and returned rich with spoil to their own country. But Demetrius was no sooner relieved from impending danger, than he forgot all the promises, which, in the time of his distress, he had made to Jonathan: he refused to exempt the Jews from tribute, and threatened them with war, unless the tribute were rigorously paid. Such ingratitude alienated from him the affections of the whole Jewish nation, and made them ready to assist his enemies upon the first opportunity that might offer. Accordingly, when Antiochus, the son of Alexander Balas, by the assistance of Tryphon, the governor of Antioch under his father, had vanquished Demetrius in battle, and had been crowned king of Syria, upon his sending an embassy to Jonathan soliciting his assistance against Demetrius, and promising the fulfilment of all the engagements which Demetrius had broken, Jonathan readily consented to the proposal, influenced, no doubt, by the gross treatment he had received from Demetrius. A commission was sent to Jonathan, empowering him to raise forces for the assistance of Antiochus. To divert him from this purpose, Demetrius invaded Galilee, but was defeated by Jonathan, who succeeded at the same time in reducing Joppa, Gaza, and Bethsura; but the citadel of Jerusalem still held out for Demetrius, and maintained a long siege.

His prudence and skill in politics.

Ingratitude of Demetrius.

B. C. 144.

Treaty with the Romans renewed.

On his return to Judæa, Jonathan sent ambassadors to Rome, to renew the treaty made by Judas. They were received with honour by the Senate, completed the object of their mission, and returned:[2] at the same time also a league was formed with the Lacedæmonians, because, as it was said, the Jews and Lacedæmonians were brethren, both of the stock of Abraham. A great council was now held at Jerusalem, to consult about the repairing and fortifying Jerusalem and other strongholds in Judæa. It was then agreed to heighten the fortifications of Jerusalem, and at the same time to run a line of circumvallation round the fort to cut off their supplies of provisions: by this latter measure the fort, which had been so grievous a cause of evil to the city, was eventually reduced. Jonathan employed himself in the oversight of the works at Jerusalem, whilst his brother Simon superintended the remaining fortifications in the country, so that the whole territory was now fully fortified and prepared to resist the invasion of the most powerful enemy.

Jerusalem and the neighbouring country fortified.

[1] *Antiq.* lib. xiii. p. 568. [2] Ibid. p. 573. 1 *Macc.* xii.

The assistance Tryphon had given to Antiochus was only intended B.C. 144.
to pave the way for his seizing the kingdom for himself; but so long as Jonathan remained to oppose the plot, he despaired of success. With the view of getting Jonathan into his power, Tryphon marched his army against Judæa; but being met at Bethsan by Jonathan, with forty thousand men, he deemed it most prudent to put on the mask of friendship, pretending that he had come only to consult about their common interest, and to put Ptolemais into his hands.[1] Deceived by this specious conduct, Jonathan fell into the snare laid for his destruction. He was persuaded to dismiss his army, and accompanied by no more than one thousand men, to proceed with Tryphon to Ptolemais, expecting that the city would be delivered to him: but as soon as he had entered it the gates were shut, his men were put to death, and himself taken prisoner. Tryphon advanced from Ptolemais to invade Judæa, carrying Jonathan his prisoner with him. In the meantime, Simon, having been elected by the people to succeed his brother in the chief command, met Tryphon with a great army. The traitor was afraid of engaging with Simon, and pretended that he had seized Jonathan for a debt of a hundred talents which he owed; but that if the debt were paid, and his two sons given up as hostages for his peaceable behaviour, then Jonathan should be released. Simon too hastily complied; for Tryphon failed to perform his promise, and still persisted in attempting the invasion of Judæa, being encouraged by messages from those who were besieged in the fort of Acra: but Simon so constantly baffled every attempt, that at last Tryphon retired to Galaaditis, and at the city of Bascama put Jonathan to death.

Plots of Tryphon against Jonathan.

He seizes him by treachery.

Puts him to death.

Simon hearing that his brother's body was interred at Bascama, where he was put to death, sent for his bones from that city, and buried them in the sepulchre of his father at Modin, where he afterwards erected a magnificent monument of white marble, of great height, which was visible at sea, and became a mark to direct the course of the mariner. Josephus tells us it was remaining in his time; and Eusebius speaks of it as existing two hundred years after the time of Josephus. Such was the lamentable termination of one of the bravest of the Asamonean princes. The profound policy which Jonathan displayed throughout his intercourse with foreign princes, might have led us to imagine, that he would have been the last man to have fallen so easily into a snare: in this instance his caution seems to have forsaken him; the desire of possessing the valuable port of Ptolemais probably blinded him to a sense of danger, and prevented him from suspecting the deceit of Tryphon. We cannot but lament that so brave a man, so skilful a general, and so gallant a defender of his country, should have perished by so ignominious a death; but the brave in arms are not always wise in council.

Observations on this transaction.

[1] 1 *Macc.* xiii.

SIMON.

B. C. 143. Judæa fortified.

On the death of Jonathan, Simon succeeded to his authority both in the priesthood and in the government. The first measure of Simon's government was the completion of the fortifications which were erecting throughout Judæa, his attention being especially directed to Bethsura, which he garrisoned and supplied plentifully with provisions. This extensive plan of defence, which was begun in the last year of Jonathan's government, could not have been put into execution without a vast expenditure of labour and money. We learned before that the enclosing the hill Acra with a wall was the result of a national deliberation; and we cannot doubt but that the expense of these great works was defrayed by taxes, levied for this purpose on the whole country. This fortifying of the strong places of Judæa, and the circumvallation at the fort of Acra, are testimonies that the Jews now regarded the descendants of Mattathias as their lawful sovereigns; and that they trusted that under the Roman protection they should establish their independence, and be freed from the tyranny of the Syrian government. This supposition is fully confirmed by the subsequent events; for Simon, on his accession to the throne of Judæa, obtained from Demetrius not only a confirmation of his authority, but also a release from all tributes and taxes, on condition of assisting him against Tryphon. And from this grant the Jews dated the deliverance of Judæa from a foreign power; and no longer used the era of the Seleucidæ, in their instruments and contracts, but dated them by the years of Simon and his successors.[1]

Simon an independent prince.

Encourages foreign commerce.

The government, thus regularly established, allowed the cultivation of foreign commerce. Simon, therefore, made Joppa the seaport of Judæa; from which place an intercourse began to be carried on between the different towns and islands on the Mediterranean, and was continued for many ages. He then reduced some fortresses that still held out, and besieged and took Gaza;[2] but he treated the heathen garrison mercifully, permitting them to depart the country; the place he planted with Jews, and fortifying it, built there a house for his own residence. The heathen garrison in the fort of Acra now began to feel the effects of the measures taken for its reduction; their provisions were exhausted, and being without possibility of relief, they at last surrendered the place, and were permitted by Simon to depart the land.[3]

Acra surrenders to Simon.

The hill Acra levelled.

For the last twenty-six years this garrison had been the source of infinite trouble to Jerusalem. Simon, therefore, determined not only to destroy the fort, but to reduce the hill on which it stood to a level with the mountain of the Temple; a work which was accomplished after three years' incessant labour. He also fortified anew the mountain of the Temple, and built his palace within the circuit of the wall,

[1] 1 *Macc.* xiii. 42. [2] Ibid. xiv. 5. [3] Ibid. xiii.

probably on the spot where the castle Antonia was afterwards erected. Simon also took care to train up his son John, surnamed Hyrcanus, in the arts of government, and to cultivate the natural talents which he appeared to possess; appointing him General of all his forces, and sending him to reside at Gazara, near Joppa. B.C. 143.

In this year a public recognition of Simon's government seems to have been made by the people, in testimony of gratitude to him and his family for their deliverance. Judæa was now at peace, the enemy being everywhere expelled. Such great blessings were considered worthy of some especial record: they therefore engraved on tables of brass the recital of the valiant deeds of Simon and his predecessors, together with an acknowledgment of their submission to his rule, and they affixed them in a conspicuous place within the borders of the Sanctuary.[1] At this time Simon, justly considering that it would materially strengthen his government, were his powers as High-priest and Prince of Judæa recognised by the Romans, sent an embassy for that purpose, with a present to the Senate of a massy shield of gold, weighing one thousand minæ, worth, at the lowest computation, fifty thousand pounds sterling. His ambassadors were received with every mark of respect, and the object of their mission was fully accomplished. The Senate not only renewed the league, but also sent letters to the neighbouring princes, commanding them to treat the Jews as their friends and allies. B. C. 141. Public memorial of Simon's acts. Treaty renewed with Rome. B. C. 140.

The Jews were again compelled to witness the perfidy of the Syrian kings, in their transactions with Antiochus Sidetes, who had married Cleopatra, the wife of Demetrius, and was now attempting to dispossess the usurper Tryphon. No princes were more ready to court the assistance of the Jews, in times of need, than the Syrian; none were more perfidious in prosperity, nor more open breakers of oaths and promises which they had made.[2] When this same Antiochus was desirous to secure the aid of Simon, he fully confirmed all the previous decrees made for the freedom of the Jews; and in proof of his sincerity, he conferred on him the prerogative of coining money as an independent prince; but no sooner was he seated on the throne of Syria, than he broke every engagement he had made, laid claim to the citadel of Jerusalem, Joppa, and Gazara, and demanded five hundred talents for tribute and damages sustained by the loss of these places. To enforce his claim, he invaded Judæa; but his general was defeated by Judas and John, the sons of Simon, and compelled to retire from the country. Treacherous conduct of Antiochus Sidetes. B. C. 139.

This peace, however, was far from permanent, being interrupted by the treacherous murder of the venerable Simon. A daughter of Simon had married Ptolemy, the son of Abulas, one of his officers, and governor of the city of Jericho;[3] and the ungrateful wretch, having concerted measures with Antiochus Sidetes for usurping the government, invited Simon, who was on a progress through the Murder of Simon. B. C. 136.

[1] 1 *Macc.* xiv. 48. [2] Ibid. xv. [3] Ibid. xvi.

B.C. 136. country with his sons Judas and Mattathias, to partake his hospitality at a castle near Jericho. The plot succeeded, and his father-in-law Simon, and his wife's two brothers, were murdered by him, in violation of every law of nature and every feeling of honour and of duty. John was at this time at Gazara, and happily escaping those who were sent to despatch him, hastened to Jerusalem, and secured possession of the city against those who were sent by Ptolemy to seize it.

Character of Simon.

Thus died the venerable Simon, a man who seems to have united in his own person the virtues of courage and of mercy to an extraordinary degree. His conduct to the heathen garrisons, in permitting them to depart the country, is an instance of mild generosity rarely witnessed at the period of his government. Age and prosperity had probably tempered the ferocity which displayed itself in the early wars of the sons of Mattathias. It is impossible to judge between them, whether the palm of courage belongs to one more than to another. They appear to have been equally courageous, firm, and resolute; they never avoided any danger, however great; they neither deserted their religion nor their country under the most severe trials. The end of Judas was a soldier's death, he died in battle; but his brothers were less fortunate, according to human judgment; for Jonathan fell a victim to the treachery of an enemy, and Simon to the wicked ambition of one connected with him by the closest ties.

JOHN HYRCANUS.

B. C. 136. John, the son of Simon, surnamed Hyrcanus, succeeds.

Hyrcanus having, as has been related, taken refuge in Jerusalem from the designs of Ptolemy, his father's murderer, was elected by the people to succeed Simon. He first performed the sacrifices required of him at his initiation into the High-priest's office, and then marching against Ptolemy, besieged him in a fortress near Jericho. Josephus relates[1] that the siege was carried on less vigorously, on account of the feelings of Hyrcanus on behalf of his mother and brothers; for Ptolemy, having them in his possession, brought them upon the walls, and threatened that he would throw them down headlong, if Hyrcanus persisted in the siege. The conduct of his mother is related to have been of the most heroic kind. She cried aloud from the walls to her son, "not to desist from his purpose, but to pursue his revenge, unmindful of her sufferings. To endure pain," she added, "would be pleasure to her, if it terminated in the punishment of him who had destroyed those who were dearest to her." Hyrcanus could not, however, resist the impression of pity which the sight of his mother's torments occasioned. The siege was relaxed, and being continued languidly until the following year, which was the year of the Sabbath, it was at last raised. Ptolemy then put the mother and brothers of Hyrcanus to death, and fled to Zeno, who was tyrant of

Heroic conduct of the wife of Simon.

[1] *Antiq.* lib. xiii. p. 581

Philadelphia. No farther account is given of the fate of this ungrateful man. B. C. 136.

Antiochus Sidetes, in the following year, B. C. 135, invaded Judæa, and besieged Hyrcanus in Jerusalem: the year being sabbatical, occasioned such a scarcity of provisions, as, towards the feast of tabernacles, in the autumn, reduced the besieged to the greatest necessity.[1] Hyrcanus, at this time, prayed a truce for the purpose of keeping the festival; which was not only granted by Antiochus, but he sent also beasts, and such things as were fitting and required to be offered in sacrifice. This gracious conduct gave Hyrcanus hopes that Antiochus would not be unwilling to make peace. This accordingly took place; Hyrcanus agreeing to dismantle Jerusalem, and to pay tribute to the king for Joppa and other towns which the Jews possessed out of Judæa. The king demanded also that the fortress at Acra should be rebuilt; but this Hyrcanus refused, and chose rather to pay the king five hundred talents. Hostages were delivered for the performance of the treaty, and the siege was raised. Both Josephus and Diodorus Siculus[2] concur in ascribing this peace to the clemency of Antiochus; who resisted the persuasion of those who advised him to use the opportunity of rooting out that odious nation the Jews. B. C. 135. War of Antiochus. His clemency.

Antiochus, four years after this event, made an expedition into Parthia, for the purpose of recovering his brother Demetrius Nicator, who was detained there a prisoner. Hyrcanus accompanied the king in this war, and obtained no inconsiderable share of the honour of the victories gained over the Parthians.[3] Antiochus, wintering there, was slain in a general rising of the inhabitants, and was succeeded by his brother Demetrius. Hyrcanus failed not to use to the utmost the opportunity which the troubles, then prevailing in Syria, offered of delivering himself from obedience to the Syrians, and of re-establishing the independence of Judæa. He seized several of the cities bordering on Judæa, in Syria, Phœnicia, and Arabia; and so entirely did he succeed in his purpose, that neither himself nor his successors were ever after tributary to the kings of Syria. Hyrcanus then took Sechem, the chief seat of the Samaritans, and destroyed the temple erected by Sanballat on Mount Gerizim, after it had stood two hundred years.[4] He next carried his arms against the Idumeans, and compelled them either to embrace the Jewish religion or to leave the country: they accepted the former proposal. The Edomites were circumcised and admitted as proselytes; and so complete was their incorporation into the Jewish church, that they soon became one with the nation of the Jews. B. C. 131. Hyrcanus accompanies Antiochus into Parthia. Hyrcanus takes advantage of the death of Antiochus. B. C. 130. B. C. 129.

Hyrcanus sent an embassy to Rome, the object of which was to

[1] *Antiq.* lib. xiii. p. 582.

[2] Diod. Sic. lib. 34.

[3] Eusebius, in his *Chronicon*, relates that this prince acquired his name of Hyrcanus from conquering the Hyrcanians in this expedition.

[4] *Antiq.* lib. xiii. p. 584.

B. C. 128. gain from the Romans an acknowledgment that the treaty which he had been compelled to make with Antiochus Sidetes was null and void, as being in violation of that freedom which the Romans had guaranteed to the Jews.[1] The Romans readily consented, and sent ambassadors to reinstate Hyrcanus in that freedom from the dominion of the kings of Syria which he had before enjoyed.[2] In return for this kindness, an embassy was sent the following year to testify the gratitude of the Jewish nation to the Roman Senate, and to present a cup and shield of gold, worth fifty thousand pieces. Upon this, another decree was passed by the Senate to confirm the former. The crown of Syria was once more contested between Demetrius and Alexander Zebina, who was an impostor, the son of a broker of Alexandria, but who pretended to be the son of Alexander Balas. Demetrius dying at Tyre, his wife Cleopatra reigned over one part of the kingdom, and Zebina over the rest. Zebina made alliance with Hyrcanus, who never failed, during these commotions, to advance, to the utmost of his power, the interest of his family and the prosperity of his country.

Ambassadors sent to Rome.

B. C. 126.

B. C. 110. Such circumstances indeed could not fail to increase the wealth and power of so rising a prince as Hyrcanus. We find him accomplishing the subjugation of Samaria, which he utterly destroyed; and after this victory making himself master of all Judæa, Galilee, and Samaria, and several other places in the adjacent countries.[3] He raised the glory of the Asamonean princes to its greatest height, and passed the remainder of his days respected by his neighbours and free from all foreign wars.[4] Hyrcanus had been through life attached to the sect of the Pharisees. Josephus[5] relates at some length the circumstances under which he withdrew his favour from them, and conferred it upon the opposite sect the Sadducees. It is probable that he discovered among them symptoms of disaffection; upon which he left their party, and gave encouragement to the Sadducees, by forbidding publicly the practice of those customs which the Pharisees had enjoined to be observed in addition to the law of Moses.[6] We can hardly conceive that so good a man would have denied the resurrection, as the Sadducees did in aftertimes; and indeed the account of his proceedings against the Pharisees, in annulling their precepts, imports that he foresaw the necessity of checking the evils that would result from the observance of their traditions. The Pharisees possessed influence with the lower orders, while the power of the Sadducees was confined to the wealthy. The conduct of Hyrcanus, whatever it was, served to alienate from him and from his family the affections of the Pharisees. To that sect may be ascribed the declension, and finally

Conduct of Hyrcanus towards the Pharisees.

[1] *Antiq.* lib. xiii. p. 584, and xiv. p. 623.

[2] Dr. Hales is of opinion that the decree recited by Josephus, *Ant.* xiv. p. 623, ed. Hud., by mistake, is said to have been granted to Hyrcanus II. and that it applies to the embassy here related.—Hales's *Chronology*, vol. ii. 623.

[3] *Antiq.* lib. xiii. p. 586.

[4] *De Bell. Jud.* lib. i. p. 932.

[5] *Antiq.* lib. xiii. p. 586.

[6] Ibid.

the ruin of their nation; which was destroyed by their opposition, first to their own princes, and afterwards to the Romans. B. C. 110.

Hyrcanus died, having reigned with honour thirty years. That he was a great man as a prince, we cannot doubt, when we consider how skilfully he guided the helm of state, while he raised his country to power and wealth: that he was a good man is also clear from the tradition which Josephus [1] has recorded of his being possessed of the spirit of prophecy; and had there been anything in his character worthy of blame, his opposition during the last years of his life to the encroachments of the Pharisees, would have occasioned some more grievous tale to be registered against him, by a sect of such influence, than that he rejected them because a Sadducee persuaded him that an insult, offered him by one single Pharisee, was the premeditated act of the whole party. B. C. 107. Character of Hyrcanus.

Before we proceed to recount the acts of the successors of Hyrcanus, during the decline of the Asamonean power, it may not be unprofitable to some of our readers, if we direct their attention to the remarkable consequences which we have, during the preceding history, observed to result from that extraordinary enactment of the Law of Moses, the observance of the sabbatical year. On more than one occasion, both when Bethsura was taken by the Syrians, in the time of Judas, and when Antiochus Sidetes took Jerusalem, in the reign of Hyrcanus, we have seen that those apparently unfortunate results of war might be, in a great measure, attributed to that scarcity of provisions which naturally existed during a sabbatical year; a scarcity, indeed, not amounting to famine, but yet sufficient to prevent the collection of stores against a protracted siege. During the wars carried on by Judas, Jonathan, and Simon, the sabbatical year must have continually proved an impediment to warlike operations, sufficient, certainly, in the eyes of worldly men, to have justified a suspension of its observance. The difficulties which thence ensued seem to have been cheerfully borne. The Maccabean princes were too zealous for the law, to permit so important a feature in it to be lightly guarded; and in the end we find that, under the superintending providence of that God who gave this law, and promised blessings to the Jews, if they kept it, the kingdom of Judæa rose, during this period, to a higher point of splendour and power than it had attained since the division of Solomon's kingdom, under the two kings Rehoboam and Jeroboam. This singular institution was peculiar to the theocracy established by the Mosaic law; we may consider it as a perpetual touchstone, whereby the Divine Providence tried the fidelity of the Jews. The command was one to which the divine legislator attached great importance. The pen of inspiration informs us, that the breach of it was among the causes which occasioned the captivity of Judah; for it is said that, as long as the land lay desolate, namely for seventy years, it thereby enjoyed those Sabbaths of which it had been defrauded.[2] B. C. 164. Observations on the sabbatical year.

[1] *Antiq.* lib. xiii. p. 586. *De Bell. Jud.* ib.

[2] 2 *Chron.* c. xxxvi. v 21.

ARISTOBULUS.

B. C. 106. The reign of this unfortunate prince is marked with horror. Hyrcanus was no sooner dead than his family appear to have indulged towards each other the most bitter animosities. The character of Aristobulus is presented to us in most opposite lights. His acts were those of cruelty; and yet we find Josephus[1] quoting a passage from the historian Timagenes, in which this prince is described as a man of equity, and a benefactor to his country. His reign was short and miserable; and his early death seems to have been brought about, in a great measure, by the pain and anxiety which he suffered. The events of the year in which he reigned are probably attributable to the intrigues of party, and to the same turbulent ambition of the Pharisees, which embittered the latter days of Hyrcanus. As soon as Aristobulus was seated on the throne, he put the royal diadem on his head, and assumed the title of king, being the first that bore this title since the time of the Babylonish captivity. His mother was amongst the foremost of those who disputed his sovereignty, and claimed a right to the supreme power by his father's will. Aristobulus put her in prison and starved her to death; an act of cruelty not to be justified, even by the most ambitious and rebellious designs of a mother. Perhaps with a view of showing his own unambitious disposition, he admitted his brother Antigonus to partnership in the kingdom; whilst, for the security of his person, he put his three remaining brothers into prison. Aristobulus was successful in a war which he made upon the Itureans; and imitating the example of his father, he compelled them to be circumcised, or to quit their country. Returning from this expedition, and suffering from sickness, he found no peace, where he had most reason to expect it, in his own house. The cruel death to which his mother had been condemned, acted as a scourge upon himself and his family; a sure proof that worldly honour can seldom hope to be secured by the commission of unnatural cruelty. His queen, Salome, and the courtiers of her party, were continually exciting him to jealousy of his favourite brother, whom, upon false suspicion, he put to death. This event brought so strongly to his mind, now oppressed with sickness, the remembrance of his mother's untimely end, that his disorder rapidly increased upon him, and he died in bitter agony, lamenting his cruelty to his mother, and his folly in believing that his brother was false to his interests.

Aristobulus assumes the title of king.

Conquers the Itureans.

ALEXANDER JANNÆUS.

B. C. 105. This prince was the third son of Hyrcanus. One of the first acts of his reign was the putting his next brother to death, for entertaining treasonable designs against him. He attempted to take Ptolemais,

[1] *Antiq.* lib. xiii. p. 590.

and besieged it; but Ptolemy Lathyrus, who reigned in Cyprus, came B. C. 105.
to the relief of the city, and not only caused the siege to be raised, but subsequently invaded Judæa, and would have reduced Alexander to the greatest extremity, had not Cleopatra sent an army from Egypt to his assistance. Alexander was successful in taking Gadara, after a siege of ten months; but being foiled in his attempts upon Amathus, a city beyond Judæa, he returned to Jerusalem in disgrace. The misfortunes which thus befel him were gratifying to the Pharisees, who, since their quarrel with his father, had become bitter enemies to the royal family, and to none more than to Alexander, from whom they strove, by all the means in their power, to alienate the affections of the people.

Notwithstanding the considerable success which afterwards attended B. C. 95.
him in his wars, the flame of dissension at last broke out. In the eleventh year of his reign, whilst in the act of officiating as High-priest at the altar, at the feast of tabernacles, he was insulted by the populace, and pelted with citrons, to which violence they added the most opprobrious language, implying that he was descended from a slave, and unworthy of being either High-priest or king.[1] Alexander, enraged at this treatment, ordered his guards to fall upon the populace, and he thus occasioned the slaughter of 6,000 persons. To prevent a recurrence of the like insult, he railed in the court of the priests, so as to exclude the approach of the people: and for the safety of his person, he employed a guard of 6,000 mercenaries. The Pharisees were doubtless the instigators of all these disturbances. Much blame attaches itself to the conduct of Alexander; but the most efficient cause of all the misery which afflicted the Jewish nation, in the civil war then begun, was their desertion of the pure Law of Moses, and the adoption of that corrupt system of religion, of which the Pharisees were the authors. The people, now addicted to Pharisaic superstitions, were condemned to suffer, from the intrigues of that party, the evil consequences of intestine divisions, and all the miseries of civil war: so wonderful is that dispensation of Providence which, under the Jewish Law, and not less under the Christian covenant, converts a national sin into the means of a national punishment. Alexander endeavoured to divert the attention of the people from affairs at home, by engaging in war, and succeeded in making the inhabitants of the lands of Moab and Gilead tributary to him. This temporary success served for a while to abate the fury of the storm; but three years after, being unfortunate in an expedition against the country of Gaulonitis, and losing nearly all his army, on his return to Jerusalem, the Jews took advantage of his desolate situation, and openly rebelled against him. A civil war then ensued, which continued for six years; during which, although he repeatedly defeated the forces of the rebels, he was utterly unable to subdue their refractory spirit. "Wearied at length with punishing and destroying his people, he sought an accommoda-

Civil dissensions under his government.

Evil influence of the Pharisees.

Alexander conquers Moab and Gilead.

[1] *Antiq.* lib. xiii. p. 596.

B. C. 95. tion, and offered to grant them any reasonable conditions they chose. With one voice they desired him to cut his throat, for they could be at peace with him on no other terms; and that, considering the great mischiefs he had done them, it were well they could be reconciled to him, even in his grave.[1] They sent for succours to Demetrius Eucerus, king of Damascus, who brought a powerful army to their assistance, and overthrew Alexander, with the loss of all his Greek mercenaries, to a man, and he would have been utterly ruined, had not 6,000 of the Jews themselves, compassionating his distress, revolted
B. C. 89. from the Syrians and joined him. Being a man of most undaunted spirit, and possessing great resources in himself, he continued the war with his own people after the departure of the Syrians; and at length he defeated them with great slaughter, and shut up the remainder in
B. C. 86. Bethome, which he besieged and took the year after. On this occasion he was guilty of a most barbarous act of cruelty, which got him the appellation of Thracidas, "the Thracian." He brought 800 of
His cruelty. the prisoners to Jerusalem, and there crucified them all in one day, and put their wives and children to death before their faces, as they hung dying on the crosses; whilst he, his wives, and concubines, were feasting in view of the horrid scene, to glut their eyes with the spectacle! After this, Alexander had no more disturbance; the rebels who survived, flying the country, after he had destroyed about 50,000 of them
B. C. 82. in the course of the war. He then spent three years in recovering
Gives himself up to luxury. fortresses which had revolted during the civil war, and extended his conquests beyond Jordan. He returned to Jerusalem victorious, and gave himself up to luxury and drunkenness, which brought on a quartan ague, under which he languished for three years, and at length died at the siege of Ragaba, beyond Jordan, in the country of Gerasenes. In his last moments, he advised Alexandra, his queen, to conceal his death until the capture of the fortress, and then, on their triumphant return to Jerusalem, he recommended her to convene the heads of the Pharisees, and offer to be guided by their counsels in the administration of the kingdom; and to lay his dead body before them,[2] and resign it wholly to their discretion, whether to treat it with ignominy, in revenge for all the evils they had suffered from him, or otherwise; adding, that if she followed this advice, she would not only procure him an honourable funeral, but security for herself and her
B. C. 78. children. And the event justified the prediction: for his funeral obsequies were more splendid than those of any of his predecessors; and Alexandra, according to his will, was quietly established in the government.[3]

QUEEN ALEXANDRA.

B. C. 78. Alexandra, being settled on the throne, appointed Hyrcanus, her eldest son, to the office of High-priest, and gave up everything to the

[1] *Antiq.* lib. xiii. p. 597. [2] Ibid. p. 600. [3] *Hales's Chronology*, vol. ii. p. 626.

entire direction of the Pharisees: as Josephus observes, Alexandra had the kingdom, and the Pharisees the power. The decree of Hyrcanus against them was immediately revoked; the exiles of their party were recalled; and revenge was executed upon those by whose advice Alexander had put to death the 800 rebels. Hyrcanus, the High-priest, being a man of easy temper, did not attempt any opposition to these proceedings: but at last Aristobulus, the younger brother, incensed at the persecutions still carried on by the Pharisees against all his father's former adherents, put himself at the head of the party opposed to the Pharisees, and went with them openly to remonstrate with the queen against these proceedings. The queen, touched with the statement of their sufferings, so far agreed to their demands, as to put into the hands of Aristobulus and his friends all the fortresses [1] except Hyrcania, Alexandrium, and Machærus; and in these places they found refuge from the tyranny of the Pharisees.

B. C. 78. Alexandra his wife succeeds. Hyrcanus made High-priest.

Aristobulus was sent in the following year to relieve Damascus from the incursions of Ptolemy Mannœus. He took possession of the city; but employed the power thus invested in him to no other advantage than that of securing to himself the affections of the army. Tigranes, king of Armenia, was at this time employed in the siege of Ptolemais, which occasioned no small anxiety to the queen, lest he should invade Judæa; but the progress of the Roman arms in Pontus and Cappadocia, warning him to provide for the defence of Armenia, Jerusalem and Judæa were thereby relieved from the impending danger. A short time previous to the invasion of Armenia by the Romans, Alexandra died, having attained the age of seventy-three years.

B. C. 72.

In the account which Josephus [2] gives of her, we read the perfect character of an ambitious woman. "She was," says he, "destitute of the natural weakness of her sex. In her own love of rule she at once displayed the power her mind possessed in the management of affairs, and at the same time gave proof of the follies of mankind in the errors which they commit in order to obtain dominion: for, utterly regardless of future consequences, if she could but obtain some present good, and counting every object inferior to the absolute possession of power, in the accomplishment of her desires, she paid no regard to the principles either of honour or of justice. And to such extremity did she reduce her own family, whilst she sought more than it became woman to possess, that she caused them to lose that power to which she had aspired in spite of the greatest perils, committing herself to the guidance of those most hostile to her family, and leaving her kingdom deprived of persons able to govern its affairs. The policy she pursued when alive, after her death filled her palace with calamity and trouble; and yet, during her reign, she preserved the country in peace."

B. C. 69. Character of Alexandra.

[1] *Antiq.* lib. xiii. p. 601.

[2] Ibid. p. 603.

HYRCANUS THE SECOND.

B. C. 69. The reign of this prince did not exceed three months in duration.

Short reign of Hyrcanus.

His younger brother Aristobulus took every advantage of the sickness which preceded his mother's death to get possession of the fortresses. The army was attached to him; and the people, now weary of the lordly tyranny of the Pharisees, were ready enough to encourage a change of government. The Pharisees represented to Alexandra, whilst on her death-bed, the designs of Aristobulus, but she declined interfering in the dispute. On the death of the queen, a battle took place between the forces raised by the Pharisees in favour of Hyrcanus, and the army of Aristobulus; after which Hyrcanus willingly resigned the High-priesthood and the kingdom, and was contented to lead a quiet life under his brother's protection. Thus, as Josephus[1] relates, Aristobulus went to the palace, and Hyrcanus to the house of Aristobulus; and so ended the tyranny which for the space of nine years had been exercised by the Pharisees over the whole nation.

ARISTOBULUS THE SECOND.

B. C. 69. On the expulsion of Hyrcanus, his brother, Aristobulus the Second, ascended the throne. The weakness of Hyrcanus seemed little likely to disturb his reign; but there appeared an enemy to contend with more subtle than his brother; and the combination of circumstances abroad unhappily aided the designs which his adversary formed against him. The vices of the later Asamonean princes, their family dissensions, and submission to the teachers of a corrupt religion, had dimmed the lustre of that glory which shone upon them during the reigns of the first five of their race. Vice, whether in the palace or in the abodes of private life, is equally destructive: it undermines alike the wealth of the private man and the stability of the throne; and we find that, in the instance of the Asamonean family, their own wickedness and folly paved the way for the establishment of the authority of the Herods over their master's house.

Origin of Antipater, the father of Herod the Great.

The disturbances which happened in Judæa at this time, and the revolution that succeeded, arose from the aspiring temper of Antipater, the father of Herod the Great. This Antipater was an Idumean by birth, but in religion a Jew, the son of Antipas, a nobleman of Idumea, who, under the reign of Alexander Jannæus, was appointed governor of that country, and enjoyed the esteem and friendship of Jannæus and his queen Alexandra.[2] The young Antipater, the father of Herod, being brought up in the court, contracted the strongest friendship with Hyrcanus, and naturally looked to his suc-

[1] *Antiq.* lib. xiv. p. 607. [2] Ibid. p. 608.

cession to the crown as the means of promoting his own aggrandizement. The deposition of Hyrcanus frustrated all his hopes; for he could scarcely expect safety, much less favour, from Aristobulus: he therefore exerted himself to the utmost to repair the fortunes of Hyrcanus, and with them his own. Hyrcanus was a man of too easy a temper to be excited to exertion by the feelings of ambition. Antipater, therefore, found no other means of winning him to his purpose than by insinuating that danger to his life was to be apprehended from Aristobulus. In the meantime he treated with Aretas, king of Arabia Petræa, and engaged him to furnish an army to assist Hyrcanus: many of the Jews were also ready, through his intrigues, to join in the atttempt. After much solicitation, Antipater prevailed on Hyrcanus to fly from Jerusalem, and to take refuge with Aretas; who immediately marched an army of 50,000 men into Judæa, and being there joined by the Jews of Hyrcanus's party, gave battle to Aristobulus, defeated him, and compelled him to retire into the Temple mount at Jerusalem, where he besieged him. It happened that at this time Pompey was carrying on the war against Tigranes and Mithridates in Armenia. A division of the Roman army, under the command of Scaurus, had been detached by Pompey and sent into Syria, and Scaurus was now on his march to Judæa, when the two brothers sent to make offers to procure his assistance. Scaurus deemed it most prudent to accept those of Aristobulus, and therefore sent orders to Aretas to retire, under penalty of having war made upon him by the Romans if he refused. Aristobulus now in turn attacked Aretas and Hyrcanus, and defeated them with great slaughter.

B. C. 69.

Intrigues of Antipater.

Aretas besieges Jerusalem.

B. C. 65.

As soon as Pompey had finished his war in Armenia, he came to Damascus, and reduced Cœle-Syria to a Roman province. On his return to Cœle-Syria in the following year, he was met by ambassadors, both from the Jewish nation and from the two brothers Aristobulus and Hyrcanus, beseeching him to decide the quarrel between them.[1] In the ensuing spring he came to Damascus; and then directed his attention to the statements these ambassadors made to him respecting Judæa, and permitted the two brothers to plead their cause before him. The representatives of the Jewish people, alike hostile to the interests of Hyrcanus and of Aristobulus, declared their unwillingness to submit any longer to a kingly government, having always been accustomed to be subject to priests and not to kings. They acknowledged that the two princes were of the sacerdotal family, but that they changed the form of government for the purpose of reducing the people to slavery. No circumstance could prove more strongly the real weakness of the power of the royal family than this declaration of the Jewish nation to Pompey, nor could show more plainly that Judæa was prepared to become an easy

B. C. 64.

B. C. 63.

Aristobulus and Hyrcanus appeal to Pompey.

[1] *Antiq.* lib. xiv. p. 611.

B. C. 63. acquisition to the Roman power. Hyrcanus pleaded the injustice of
Weakness of the regal power. his younger brother, in depriving him of his authority; to which Aristobulus replied, by urging the imbecility of Hyrcanus, and his
Crafty policy of Pompey. evident unfitness to hold the reins of government. The artful Roman did not immediately pronounce his judgment upon the merits of the cause; but perceiving that the weakness of Hyrcanus presented the fewest obstacles to the extension of the Roman conquests, he secretly determined in his favour; but apparently left the matter undecided, until he should have leisure to come in person and settle the business at Jerusalem. The crafty intentions of Pompey did not escape the observation of Aristobulus. On his return from Damascus, he began preparations of defence—a circumstance which incensed the Roman general against him, and more fully determined him to depose him.
Aretas conquered. It was no difficult task to overcome Aretas, and deprive Aristobulus of all hope of resistance to the Roman power from that quarter. Pompey took Petræa, the capital city of Arabia Petræa, and made Aretas a prisoner; but released him on his submitting to the terms which he imposed. He then came unto Judæa, and found Aristobulus in the strong fortress at Alexandrium. The behaviour of Pompey was that of a man conscious of his own power, and of the weakness of his enemy. He commanded Aristobulus to come and treat with him. Several conferences took place; at the last of which the Roman general ordered him to deliver up his fortresses, and to sign orders for the surrender of them before he quitted the camp. Aristobulus now perceived that there was no hope of obtaining anything by negotiation, he therefore fled to Jerusalem, and there prepared to make a stand against Pompey; but as soon as the Roman army advanced thither his courage failed, and he tried to make peace, by promising entire submission, and by paying a certain sum of money. Pompey accepted the proposal, and sent Gabinius to receive the money; who returned, having found the gates shut, with an answer that the people would not comply with the conditions.
Pompey besieges Jerusalem. Pompey, incensed at this treatment, marched his whole army against Jerusalem. The friends of Hyrcanus soon admitted him into the city; but Aristobulus and his party, having possession of the mountain of the Temple, there sustained a siege for three months; nor would the fortress have been taken in the end, had not Pompey perceived that though on the Sabbath-days the Jews resisted any assault made upon them, they did not then make any attempts to hinder the works which were carrying on. He therefore gave orders not to make any assault on the Sabbath; but to take advantage of that time, by employing it in carrying forward the works, advancing the battering engines, and filling up the ditches.[1] At length the Romans succeeded in making a breach in the wall, and assaulted the place. The number of those who perished was reckoned at not less than 12,000:

[1] *Antiq.* lib. xiv. p. 614.

none were more cruel in the carnage than the Jews of Hyrcanus's party. Amidst this dreadful destruction the priests still persevered in performing their duty in the Temple; many fell by the sword at the very altars, and mingled their own blood with the blood of the sacrifices. The day on which the fortress was taken was that on which a solemn fast was observed, for the capture of the Temple by Nebuchadnezzar. The constancy and self-devotion of the priests failed not to meet with the admiration of Pompey. A parallel to it is scarcely to be met with in the records of history. As soon as the place surrendered, Pompey, with several of his generals, took a survey of the Temple; and, not contented with viewing the outer courts, entered into the most holy place; which was a profanation and an insult to their religion bitterly felt and most grievously resented by the Jews. The treasures contained in the Temple he left untouched, and gave orders for the continuance of the service as before; an abstinence which little atoned for the impiety of which he had been guilty. It has been remarked of Pompey, that up to this period of his life he experienced the greatest success in all his undertakings; but after this act of profanation he never prospered, his victory at Jerusalem being the last he ever achieved. On the taking of Jerusalem, Pompey restored the High-priesthood to Hyrcanus, and made him Prince of the country, but forbade his wearing the diadem. He then dismantled Jerusalem, and made Judæa tributary to the Romans; and separating from its government all the Syrian and Phœnician cities taken by the predecessors of Hyrcanus, made Scaurus President of Syria. He then returned to Rome, carrying with him Aristobulus, his two sons, Alexander and Antigonus, and two of his daughters, to grace his triumph.

B. C. 63.

Captures it.

Profanes the Temple.

Unprosperous ever after.

Hyrcanus made High-priest.

HYRCANUS THE SECOND (RESTORED).

When we consider the continual interference of the Roman authority in the internal affairs of Judæa, which took place after the conquest of Jerusalem by Pompey, and the influence which Antipater possessed over the mind of Hyrcanus, it appears evident that the restoration of Hyrcanus was purely nominal, and that the limited power possessed by the Prince of Judæa, in reality pertained to Antipater, and not to the nominal King. Whilst Pompey was on his way to Rome, Alexander, the eldest son of Aristobulus, effected his escape. In the year B. C. 57, he collected in Judæa an army of 10,000 men, and seizing the fortresses of Hyrcania, Alexandrium, and Machærus, ravaged the country. Gabinius, the President of Syria, despatched Mark Antony to oppose this attempt of Alexander. Antony, uniting his forces with those of Antipater and Hyrcanus, soon defeated Alexander, and compelled him to retire to the fortress at Alexandrium. By the mediation of his mother, Gabinius concluded

B. C. 63.

Escape of Alexander.

B. C. 57.

Attempts to recover Judæa.

B. C. 57. a peace with him, on condition of his surrendering Alexandrium and the other fortresses, which were afterwards demolished by her advice, lest they should aid further revolts.

The policy of Gabinius, President of Syria.

In order to weaken the power of the Jewish nation by increasing a number of independent cities near Judæa, Gabinius gave orders for the rebuilding of Samaria, Azotus, Zamnia, Scythopolis, and several other cities which had been destroyed by the Asamonean princes. The government of these cities was probably constituted in the aristocratic form; for soon after the taking of Alexandrium, Gabinius came to Jerusalem and altered the form of government from the monarchial to the aristocratical,[1] leaving to Hyrcanus no other authority than that of the High-priesthood. Until this time justice had been administered throughout Judæa by the two Sanhedrims, or courts of justice: the lesser existed in every city, and consisted of twenty-three persons; the other, called the Greater Sanhedrim, consisted of seventy persons, and sat at Jerusalem, and to it an appeal lay from the courts beneath. This constitution naturally made Jerusalem the chief place of authority. Gabinius most effectually overthrew this superiority by establishing five supreme independent Sanhedrims, at Jerusalem, Jericho, Gadara, Amathus, and Sepphoris. By this means all power was taken from Hyrcanus and given to the nobles; whilst, at the same time, the nation was deprived of a common centre of union. The existence of the little authority which remained to Hyrcanus and Antipater solely depending on the permission of the Romans, it is not surprising to find Antipater endeavouring, by every means in his power, to ingratiate himself with them.

Establishes five independent Sanhedrims.

Administration of Antipater.

B. C. 56. The Jews in Egypt were a most powerful body. In the invasion of Egypt by Gabinius and Mark Antony, a great part of the success which attended them was owing to the influence of Antipater, who wrote to the Jews and persuaded them to assist the invading army; by which means Pelusium was taken, and a way opened for the admission of the Romans. Two years previously, Aristobulus, escaping from Rome, had made one more attempt, by raising an army in Judæa, to recover his authority; but being besieged in Machærus, he was taken prisoner by Gabinius, and his enterprise entirely failed. This year his son Alexander repeated the attempt, in the absence of Gabinius in Egypt, and raised a force of 30,000 men, with which he ravaged the country; but on the return of the Roman general, he was defeated near Mount Tabor, and his whole army dispersed. Crassus succeeded Gabinius in the government of Syria. His avarice could not withstand the temptation to plunder the Temple at Jerusalem of its treasures,[2] which amounted to 10,000 talents; but this sacrilege was only the prelude to his ruin, for in the following year he perished in the Parthian war, being defeated with great slaughter, and himself and his son killed near Charræ in Mesopotamia.

Antipater persuades the Jews to assist the Romans

B. C. 55.

B. C. 54.

Crassus plunders the Temple.

[1] *Antiq* lib. xiv. p. 617.

[2] Ibid. p. 618.

The civil wars between Pompey and Cæsar hastened the destruction of the Asamonean family. Cæsar released Aristobulus out of prison, and sent him with two legions to promote his interests in Judæa; but the friends of Pompey contrived to get rid of so troublesome an opponent, by poisoning him on his way thither. A fate not less miserable befel his son Alexander, who had raised forces in Judæa, expecting his father to arrive, but Pompey sent orders to Scipio, President of Syria, to seize him and put him to death: he was accordingly taken and brought to Antioch, and after a formal trial, put to death. It would be foreign to our purpose to relate the various fortunes which attended Julius Cæsar in his road to power. We cannot, however, avoid noticing that Cæsar was considerably indebted for his release from the difficulties which surrounded him in Egypt, immediately after Pompey's death, to the courage and prudence of Antipater the Idumean; for, when Mithridates had been sent by Cæsar to levy forces in Syria and Cilicia, and to come to his succour in Egypt, Antipater and Hyrcanus not only provided a considerable force in aid of Cæsar, but also accompanied Mithridates in person. In the siege of Pelusium, Antipater was foremost in the assault of the city; and most materially contributed, by his personal valour, to the capture of the place. And but for the presence of Antipater and Hyrcanus, the expedition of Mithridates would have been entirely frustrated by the Jews of the province of Oneion, who had seized the passes, and refused him admittance; but Antipater persuaded them not only to permit the passage of the troops, but also to join Cæsar's party. Nor did his services end here; for in an engagement which took place with the army of Ptolemy, Mithridates commanding, in conjunction with Antipater, the division of Mithridates was entirely defeated; but Antipater, having routed the part opposed to him, came to his assistance, and at last succeeded in defeating the enemy with great slaughter. It is worthy of remark, that Cæsar, the founder of the dynasty destined by Providence to complete the overthrow of the Jewish economy, was considerably aided and forwarded on his road to power by this very nation: and the conqueror showed himself grateful to Antipater for that service; for on his arrival in Syria, he refused to listen to the claims Antigonus, the surviving son of Aristobulus, made upon him (in consideration, no doubt, of the death of his father and brother in Cæsar's service) for his restoration to the kingdom, and restored the supreme authority to Hyrcanus, abolishing the aristocratical constitution of Gabinius, and appointing Antipater Procurator of Judæa, under Hyrcanus. Antipater was a man of great wisdom and foresight, and had acquired such influence in Judæa and Arabia, Syria and Palestine, as made him necessary to the Roman governors in those parts: and to none did he render more service than to Cæsar, who, without his assistance, could never have raised that army, to which he owed his deliverance in Egypt. Antipater had now four sons grown up, of great reputation for valour and

B. C. 49.

B. C. 48.

Cæsar assisted in Egypt by Antipater.

Cæsar requites Antipater for his assistance.

B. C. 47.

Antipater's family.

B. C. 47. wisdom: the eldest was Phasael, whom he made governor of Jerusalem; the second Herod, whom he appointed governor of Galilee; the third son was Joseph, and the fourth Pheroras: he had also a daughter, Salome, a woman of an intriguing spirit, who lived to create serious disturbances in the family. The height to which Antipater had raised himself and his family, failed not to render his prosperity odious to the Jews of the aristocratic party. Herod having exerted himself with great courage against the robbers who infested his district, and put their leader to death by his own authority, and without any formal trial, several of the leading Jews laid hold of this circumstance to summon him to answer before the Sanhedrim for his conduct.[1] Herod came attended by his guards, and clothed in purple, and bearing with him a menacing letter from Sextus Cæsar, the President of Syria, commanding the Sanhedrim to acquit him. Awed by this behaviour, the whole assembly remained silent, when Sameas, a man of great courage and integrity, boldly stepped forward, and arraigned him both for his crime, and also for his presumption in coming thither so attended; and he predicted that this Herod would one day destroy them all, an event which afterwards came to pass, for he put Hyrcanus, and all the members of the Sanhedrim, to death, Pollio and Sameas only excepted. At this time Hyrcanus seeing the assembly, at the instigation of Sameas, inclined to condemn Herod, adjourned the meeting: thus giving opportunity for him to make his escape to Damascus during the night. It was with difficulty that Herod was dissuaded by his father and brother from marching an army to Jerusalem, to avenge the insult he had received from the Sanhedrim.

Herod accused by the Sanhedrim.

B. C. 44. On the return of Julius Cæsar from the African war, Hyrcanus sent an embassy to him, requesting his permission to repair and fortify Jerusalem; who not only granted his request, but by a decree confirmed Hyrcanus in his authority, as High-priest and Ethnarch; remitted the tribute to be paid by the Romans during the sabbatical year; and granted such farther privileges to the Jews, throughout the empire, that they could hardly be said to feel the weight of the Roman yoke. Josephus[2] has preserved the various decrees made by Cæsar in favour of the Jews, as an argument to confirm his account of the esteem in which the Persian and Macedonian princes held his nation. "For," says he, "if some doubt the truth of what is asserted on this point, because the evidence is not to be found but in the records of our own, and some barbarous nations, they will surely think it worthy of credit, when they read what decrees the Romans made in our favour; decrees not to be denied, but registered in the public offices, and engraved on the pillars of the Capitol."

The Jews protected by Cæsar.

Death of Cæsar.

Syria seized by Cassius.

By the assassination of Cæsar, which event took place soon after, the Roman empire was thrown into the greatest confusion. Cassius, one of the conspirators, seized Syria,[3] and being compelled to levy heavy contributions on the country for the support of his army, the

[1] *Antiq.* lib. xiv. p. 626. [2] Ibid. p. 628. [3] Ibid. p. 637.

territory of Hyrcanus was taxed at 700 talents. Antipater made B. C. 44.
every exertion to raise the sum appointed, and divided the labour of making the assessment between his two sons, Phasael and Herod, and a nobleman, attached to the interests of Hyrcanus, named Malichus. The district allotted to Malichus failing of affording the proper supply, Cassius ordered the inhabitants to be sold, and would have put Malichus to death, had not Antipater redeemed his life, by the payment of 100 talents out of the treasury of Hyrcanus. Malichus repaid this kindness by the basest ingratitude. Jealous of the authority of Antipater, and disdaining any longer to promote the welfare of Hyrcanus, whilst he held only the second place under Antipater the Idumean, he plotted the entire destruction of the friend to whom he owed the preservation of his life. The treachery of Mali- Treachery of Malichus.
chus was soon suspected by Antipater and his sons; but on being charged with it, he so solemnly protested his innocence, that Antipater became reconciled to him. On this occasion the ungrateful villain once more owed his life to Antipater, who would not allow one of his two sons to act upon the persuasion he entertained of Malichus's treachery, and thus saved him from death. Malichus, however, soon Death of Antipater.
after poisoned him at a banquet given by Hyrcanus, and took possession of the government of Jerusalem. Still the crafty traitor strove to persuade Phasael and Herod of his innocence; but to no purpose, for they procured him to be assassinated at Tyre, by the Roman garrison, under orders to that effect from Cassius.

By the defeat of Brutus and Cassius at Philippi, the sons of Herod were deprived of their strongest support, the protection of Cassius. The faction of Malichus gained Hyrcanus as well as Felix, the Roman governor, to their side, by representing to them how much was to be B. C. 42
feared from the overgrown power of the sons of Antipater. Phasael, Jealousy against the sons of Antipater.
however, by the vigour of his proceedings, soon recovered the ascendancy by attacking Jerusalem, and expelling the Roman governor. The sons of Antipater failed not to upbraid Hyrcanus with his base desertion of the family of Antipater, to whose wise administration he was indebted for everything which he possessed; but all differences between them were speedily removed by Herod's espousing Mariamne, the Herod espouses Mariamne.
beautiful granddaughter of Hyrcanus.[1] The suppressed faction, though moderated, was by no means extinguished; for they called to them Antigonus, the son of Aristobulus, and under pretence of restoring him to his father's throne, raised fresh disturbances in the country: his B. C. 41
claim was supported by Marion, king of Tyre, Fabius, governor of Damascus, and Ptolemy, prince of Chalcis, who married the daughter of Aristobulus. The next year Antony, coming to Antioch, was met by a deputation sent from the Jewish nation to accuse Phasael and Herod of usurping the government of Hyrcanus. Antony allowed them a hearing in the presence of Hyrcanus,[2] and then inquiring of him whom he thought fittest to manage the government under him,

[1] *Antiq.* lib. xiv. p. 639. [2] Ibid. p. 624.

B. C. 41. according to his recommendation, made the two brothers Tetrarchs, and committed the administration of affairs entirely to them. He also imprisoned several of the deputies, and would have put them to death, had not Herod saved them by his intercession. The troubles of Herod were not yet ended. The Parthian general Pacorus having taken Sidon and Ptolemais, was induced, by an offer of 1,000 talents and 500 Jewish women, to assist Antigonus in his claim to the throne. The forces of the two brothers were superior to the Parthians, who, finding themselves unable to accomplish their purpose by force, had recourse to treachery, and by it they succeeded. Contrary to Herod's advice, Phasael and Hyrcanus were induced to go in an embassy to the Parthian governor, as the readiest means of obtaining peace: as soon as the governor had them in his power, he put them both in chains. Herod escaped from Jerusalem, and fled to Massada, a strong fortress on the lake Asphaltitis. The Parthians then plundered the country, placed Antigonus on the throne,[1] and giving up to him Hyrcanus and Phasael, left the country. Phasael, knowing his death to be determined on, destroyed himself. Antigonus spared the life of Hyrcanus; but barbarously cut off his ears, to incapacitate him from exercising the priest's office, and then sent him in exile to Seleucia in Babylonia.

Hyrcanus dethroned.

ANTIGONUS.

B. C. 40. Under this emergency, Herod made all haste to Rome, intending to procure the assistance of Antony and the Romans to place Aristobulus, the brother of Mariamne, on the throne. It does not appear that Herod had any other view at this time than that of governing the country under Aristobulus, as his father had done under Hyrcanus; but Antony chose rather to place Herod on the throne, and procured a decree from the senate to that effect. Herod immediately returned to Jerusalem, and raising forces, he relieved the fortress at Massada, which Antigonus had in the meantime besieged. The next year Herod still persevered in carrying on the war against Antigonus, and after encountering him with various success, obtained a signal victory over him. Herod was assisted in this war by the Roman generals; who, however, wasted the country so much, that in reality they more hindered than promoted his interests. It undoubtedly was the interest of the Romans to weaken the power of the Jewish nation; and by departing from the line of policy which they had always followed of preserving the throne to lawful possessors, and giving it in this instance to Herod, who was a stranger, they caused such dissensions between the king and the people, as destroyed all power of opposition to themselves, and in fact reduced Judæa to the rank of a Roman province. The following year Herod besieged Jerusalem,[2] and consummated his marriage with Mariamne, in the hope of conciliating the people to his government by this affinity to the Asamonean family. After a siege

Herod made king.

B. C. 39.

Assisted by the Romans.

[1] *Antiq.* lib. xiv. p. 643. [2] Ibid. p. 658.

of more than six months the city was taken: the Romans plundered the city, and massacred the inhabitants, being instigated to this cruelty by the general, Sosius. Herod complained that the Romans would make him king of a desert; and was forced to redeem the city by a considerable sum of money. Antigonus surrendered himself to Sosius, and implored his mercy; but he, despising such pusillanimity, rejected him with scorn, and calling him Antigona, sent him in chains to Antony at Antioch: who, not long after, at the solicitation of Herod, put him to death in the manner of a common malefactor. The Romans had never before so treated any crowned head. They acted thus, hoping to diminish the attachment of the Jews to the Asamonean family, who, so long as Antigonus was alive, could not be brought to acknowledge Herod as their king. Such was the termination of the Asamonean dynasty, after it had existed 129 years from the commencement of the authority of Judas Maccabeus; or 126 years, if we date it more correctly, and agreeably to the chronology of Josephus, from the acknowledgment of Judas's power by Antiochus Eupator, B.C. 163.

B. C. 39. Takes Jerusalem. B. C. 37. Execution of Antigonus. End of the Asamonean dynasty.

The fortunes of this house, says Dr. Hales, seem to be referred to in the following obscure sequel of Micah's prophecy:—

> Chap. v. 5. When the Assyrian shall have come into our land,
> Then shall be raised up against him
> Seven shepherds and eight princes of men.
> 6. And they shall waste with the sword
> The land of Asher, the land of Nimrod, in its coasts:
> Thus shall He deliver [us] from the Assyrian,
> When he shall have come into our land,
> And when he shall have trampled on our borders.

The Assyrian here (according to the ingenious conjecture of Dr. Gregory Sharpe) aptly denotes Antiochus Epiphanes, and the succeeding kings of Syria, who ruled in Assyria and Babylonia, and as we have seen, greatly oppressed the Jews. The "seven shepherds," to be raised up by the Messiah for the deliverance of his people, represent the seven Maccabees, old Mattathias, his five sons, and his grandson John Hyrcanus; who signalized themselves in the defence of their country, and carried the war into the enemy's land of "Asher and Nimrod;" and the last, in particular, raised the glory of his house to the highest pitch, and derived his name Hyrcanus from his exploits in these countries. These are aptly termed "shepherds," because they were leaders of the people, acting under the great Shepherd of Israel, and the prime "leader," Christ, noticed in the foregoing part of the prophecy. Their successors are distinguished from them by the title of "princes," because, not satisfied with the modest title of "ethnarchs," and "High-priests," they assumed the crown as "kings," following the example of Aristobulus, the eldest son of Hyrcanus; who, with his two brothers, Antigonus and Jannæus, Alexandra, her two sons, Hyrcanus and Aristobulus the Second, and the two sons of the latter,

Interpretation of the prophecy of Micah.

B. C. 37. Alexander and Antigonus, make up eight. Queen Alexandra may justly be reckoned in the number; for, as Josephus observes, "she was a woman free from the weakness of her sex, and more practised in the art of government than most men."—*Hales's Chronology*, vol. ii. p. 640. If the foregoing interpretation be admitted, great importance must be attached to this prophecy of Micah; since we shall then view it as that great link in the chain of sacred prophecy, which, by describing the reign of the Asamonean princes, connects those prophecies of Daniel, which relate to the transactions of Alexander's successors prior to the rise of the Maccabees, with those more celebrated predictions contained in the book of Daniel, and in other prophets, which foretel the time, place, and other circumstances of the Messiah's coming.

CHAPTER IV.

HEROD THE GREAT.

FROM A. M. 4668, B. C. 46, TO A. M. 4711, B. C. 3.

THE course of events which led to the overthrow of the Asamonean dynasty, and the accession of Herod to the throne of Judæa, has been already detailed. The preceding history clearly shows that we may ascribe his success to his ability in command; which recommended him to the Romans, as a person able to protect the interests of their Eastern empire, by opposing the power of Judæa to the invasions of the Parthians.[1] During the nominal reign of Hyrcanus, Herod was appointed governor of Galilee. By his just and judicious government, he won the affections not only of the inhabitants, but also of Sextus Cæsar, the Roman governor; and even his enemies, when instigated by the jealousy of his own brother Phasael, could find no other ground of accusation, than general charges, that he had assumed the government, and put the chief of the robbers to death without a trial. The conduct of Herod, on this occasion, has been traced in Chapter III. In the prophetic warning, which Sameas is related to have given to the Council before which Herod was summoned to answer for his conduct, we discern the great expectations then formed of Herod. The family of Antipater had been virtually nominated to the sovereignty of the country; and in the falling condition of the Asamonean dynasty, it did not require any very great sagacity to foresee the probability that a prince like Herod, would be placed by the Roman senate on the throne of Judæa. The fears of future vengeance expressed by Sameas were, in fact, complimentary to the person whom he appeared to condemn; and even if Herod had not aspired to succeed Hyrcanus, no circumstance could have tended more to encourage such thoughts, than that of Sameas publicly foreboding that his power would be one day greater than that of the Council and of Hyrcanus. There is reason to suspect that Sameas secretly encouraged the hopes of Herod; for when Herod besieged Jerusalem,[2] Pollio and Sameas were most forward in advising the surrender of the city:[3] and in aftertimes, these two chiefs of the Pharisees were held by Herod in such esteem, that when many of that sect refused to take the oath of allegiance, he desisted for their sakes from enforcing compliance with his command. B. C. 46.

The invasion of Judæa by the Parthians, secured to Herod the possession of the kingdom. The Parthians had taken Jerusalem, and B. C. 41.

[1] Josephus, *de Bell. Jud.* lib. i. c. 14, s. 4.
[2] Josephus, *Antiq.* lib. xv. c. 1, s. 1. [3] Ibid. lib. xv. c. 10, s. 4.

B. C. 41. Accession of Herod to the throne of Judæa.

placed Antigonus, the nephew of Hyrcanus, on the throne, and carried away Hyrcanus with them as their prisoner. In this emergence, Herod hastened to Rome, intending to ask the kingdom for his brother-in-law, Aristobulus, the brother of Mariamne;[1] but Antony was so willing to advance Herod himself, and, withal, so accessible to the influence of promises of remuneration, that a decree was instantly proposed to the Senate,[2] importing that, in consideration of the dangers which might arise from the Parthian invasion, it was expedient to make Herod king of Judæa. The Senate did not hesitate to confirm the decree; and at the breaking up of the assembly, Antony and Augustus, placing Herod between them, and accompanied by the Consuls and magistrates, went in solemn procession to enrol the decree in the Capitol. The day concluded with a sumptuous entertainment, given to Herod in the house of Antony. In seven days after his arrival in Rome, Herod left Italy on his return to Judæa.[3]

[1] *Antiq.* lib. xiv. c. 14, s. 5. [2] *De Bell. Jud.* lib. i. c. 14, s. 4.

[3] *On the Chronology of the Commencement of Herod's Reign.*

The interval of three years, which elapsed between the decree in favour of Herod and Herod's becoming master of Jerusalem, constitutes a double epocha for the commencement of his reign. Josephus (*Antiq.* lib. xiv. c. 14, s. 5, edit. Hudson) states that the decree passed in the Consulship of C. Domitius Calvinus and C. Asinius Pollio, and in the 184th Olympiad. The year of this Consulship agrees with B. C. 40, U. C. 714, Varro: which is assigned as the first year of the 185th Olympiad. Usher, in *Annal.*, corrects Josephus's text, and places the date of the decree in the 185th Olympiad; but the correction is needless, for though the tables give B. C. 40 as Olympiad 185, 1, the Olympiad not commencing till July, the year B. C. 40 is partly in two Olympiads; and the apparent difficulty is solved by supposing that the decree passed before July in that year. The date of the decree forms the first epocha. The second epocha is dated from the capture of Jerusalem by the united force of Herod and Sosius, the Roman General, B. C. 37; M. Agrippa and L. Caninius Gallus, Consuls. The city, as Josephus states (*Antiq.* lib. xv. c. 1, s. 2), was taken in a sabbatical year; and that the year B. C. 37 was a sabbatical year is proved by Hales. See *Chronology*, vol. ii. p. 606, note. Dio (lib. xlix.) differs from Josephus, and places the capture in the preceding Consulship of Appius Claudius Pulcher and C. Norbanus Flaccus. Usher reconciles Josephus with Dio by supposing that the day of the capture was January 1, B. C. 37, but that by a wrong intercalation that day fell on the 31st of December, B. C. 38, which was the last day of the last-mentioned Consulship. Josephus (lib. xiv. *ad fin.*) states a very remarkable circumstance, that the capture of Jerusalem by Herod took place twenty-seven years to a day after the capture by Pompey. That Pompey took Jerusalem during the Consulship of Cicero is universally admitted. Usher having placed the capture of the city on January 1, B. C. 37, and the Consulship of Cicero beginning with B. C. 63, he conjectures either that Josephus mistook the time, or that the reading μετὰ κζ ἔτη may be rendered in the twenty-seventh year; as μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας is rendered by τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ. Amidst the difficulties with which the chronology of this period is entangled, the following arrangement appears to us liable to the fewest objections:—

B. C. 64. In October of this reformed Julian year, Cicero enters on his consulship.
December, Pompey takes Jerusalem.
40. Before July, Herod appointed king by the Senate.
37. In the spring, Herod begins the siege alone, and blockades the city; it being now the third year of his reign.
— Consummates his marriage with Mariamne.

On his arrival in Judæa, he received so little assistance from the Roman generals, that more than two years elapsed before he commenced the siege of Jerusalem. B. C. 41.

When the siege was so far advanced as to render success no longer doubtful, Herod consummated his marriage with Mariamne,[1] the daughter of Alexander, the son of Aristobulus, by a daughter of Hyrcanus; hoping by this union with the royal family of the Asamoneans, to ensure the affections of the Jews to his person. To pave the way for this union, he divorced his former wife Doris,[2] the mother of his son Antipater: but if he sought the marriage at first only from motives of interest, it became afterwards, on his part at least, an union cemented by the strongest affection: but the uncertainty of the wisest efforts of mere human policy may be seen in the subsequent events of his history; for this marriage which seemed most conducive to his power, and which he achieved by most unjust behaviour to his former wife, proved to him the source of almost all the miseries which he endured. Consummates his marriage with Mariamne.

After a siege of six months, Jerusalem surrendered.[3] The first acts of Herod's government, upon taking possession of the city, were marked with cruelty and revenge, yet not without some tincture of generosity. He advanced to rank and power those persons who had espoused his interests, and conferred the highest distinction upon Pollio and Sameas, as the reward of the counsel they had given during the siege to deliver up the city. Of the adherents of Antigonus, forty-five persons were put to death, and the most vigilant search was made, that none should escape; the gates of the city being guarded, and even the dead bodies searched as they were carried out, lest the living should escape by concealment among them. If we may credit Josephus, the chiefs of the Roman empire sold their influence with the Senate at an enormous rate. The sagacity with which Herod seized each favourable opportunity of securing to himself the attachment of Augustus and of Antony, is a striking proof of his political wisdom. B. C. 37. First acts of his reign.

B. C. 37. After the marriage, Herod is joined by Sosius, and the siege is vigorously pursued in July.

— In December the city is taken, twenty-seven years after the capture by Pompey. M. Agrippa and L. Caninius Gallus, Consuls.

It is further rendered probable that the city was taken in the end of B. C. 37 rather than at the beginning; for the year being sabbatical, the consequent want of provisions, to which Josephus ascribes in some measure the surrender, would be more felt in the autumn of a sabbatical year than at the beginning.

We must, however, not omit to mention that Prideaux, in his *Connect.* (*ad an.* 3), places the capture of the city in June; supposing that "the third month" mentioned by Josephus means the third month of the sacred year, and not as Usher supposes, the third month of the civil year, which began in September.

[1] *Antiq.* lib. xiv. c. 15, s. 14. *De Bell. Jud.* lib. i. c. 17, s. 8.

[2] *De Bell. Jud.* lib. i. c. 12, s. 3.

[3] Ibid. c. 18, s. 4. *Antiq.* lib. xv. c. 1.

B. C. 37. To the Roman general, Sosius, Herod was indebted for the capture of Jerusalem; but the ravages committed by his troops had reduced the country to the condition of a desert: to men less politic than Herod, therefore, a fair excuse would have offered itself for omitting to testify to Antony his gratitude; but he measured the propriety of his conduct more by what he was aware Antony would expect, than by his own apparent inabiltity to discharge the debt of obligation: he therefore stripped the palace of every ornament, he forced contributions from the wealthy, and even availed himself of the plunder of the dead,[1] and having converted all into money, he sent the produce to Antony at Antioch. The late king, Antigonus, was now a captive, preserved to grace a Roman triumph; but Antony, understanding that the preservation of this prince was a bar to Herod's firm settlement on the throne, in compliance with Herod's wishes, gave orders for his death. The misfortunes of Hyrcanus were lightened by the kindness of Phraates, the king of Parthia, who released him from captivity, and permitted him to reside amongst the Jews at Babylon. By them he was honoured both as their High-priest and their king: but as soon as he learned that Herod had acquired possession of Judæa, his desire to return thither prevailed over every persuasion which the Babylonians could urge, and he committed himself without the least reserve to the protection of Herod.[2] Herod's conduct towards him was outwardly of the most gracious kind; he paid him every mark of honour, admitted him to his councils, called him father, and gave him the first place at his court. Josephus attributes all this to mere hypocrisy, and, judging from the tragic termination of this prince's life, he asserts that Herod from the beginning entertained treacherous designs against Hyrcanus;[3] an account not improbable, when we consider that Hyrcanus was put to death a few years after, on very slight grounds of suspicion.

Antigonus put to death by Antony.

Hyrcanus returns to Judæa,

and is put to death by Herod.

Herod, on his accession, found the High-priest's office vacant. Had he respected either the law of Moses, which ordained an hereditary succession to the High-priesthood, or the prejudices of the people, he would have acted not only the better but the wiser part, and in all probability would have escaped the troubles which immediately began to ensue. The High-priesthood belonged of right to his brother-in-

B. C. 36. law, Aristobulus, the son of Alexandra, the young man for whom, on his flight to Rome, he at first intended to have asked the kingdom; but upon him Herod was afraid to confer this honour, lest the influence attached to the office should prove a source of danger to himself; he therefore sent to Babylon for one Ananelus, a man descended from the inferior families of the tribes of Levi, and made him High-priest in the room of Hyrcanus.[4] The pride of Alexandra could not

[1] *Antiq.* lib. xv. c. 1, s. 2. *De Bell. Jud.* lib. i. c. 18, s. 4.
[2] *Antiq.* lib. xv. c. 2.
[3] *De Bell. Jud.* lib. i. c. 22, s. 1. *Antiq.* lib. xv. c. 2.
[4] *Antiq.* lib. xv. c. 2, s. 4.

brook such an insult, and she acquainted Cleopatra with the injury: through whose influence with Antony, Ananelus was deposed, and Aristobulus, now a youth of sixteen years of age, made High-priest. B. C. 36.

Murder of Aristobulus.

Not long after, Herod secretly determined to rid himself of Aristobulus; and his purpose was hastened by the public admiration of him shown by the people at the Feast of Tabernacles:[1] for he was recommended to their affections not less by his royal descent, than by the extraordinary beauty of his person. The festival being ended, the king consented to share the hospitality of Alexandra at Jericho, and treacherously seized that opportunity to contrive the death of her son. The heat being excessive, the young men were amusing themselves with bathing in the numerous pools which adorned the gardens of the palace; Herod persuaded Aristobulus to join the sport, when, under pretence of play, the attendants commissioned by Herod suffocated him by repeated immersion. Herod was hypocrite enough to shed tears, and pretend sorrow for his death, and further tried to conceal the murder by the most magnificent display of expense at his funeral. Such vanities could ill compensate to Alexandra for the loss of her son, or soothe her anger. She communicated the particulars of the transaction to Cleopatra, and found in her a most powerful ally. Antony was on his way to Laodicea, and by the advice of Cleopatra, he summoned Herod to appear and answer before him. Herod obeyed the command; but money soon soothed the pretended indignation of Antony, and Herod returned to Jerusalem having been received as a prince instead of condemned as a criminal.

Secret instructions relative to Mariamne.

When Herod was summoned to Laodicea,[2] fearful of the worst, he secretly commissioned his uncle Joseph, in the event of his death, not to suffer Mariamne to live, and become the partner of Antony. Joseph was a man utterly unfitted to be intrusted with such a design; for, in the absurd hope of convincing Mariamne of the warmth of her husband's love, he foolishly communicated to her and to Alexandra the orders which he had received. On the return of Herod, his sister Salome, in revenge for some insult which she had received from Mariamne, insinuated against her own husband, Joseph, the existence of a criminal intercourse between them. The accusation was as unfounded as it was malicious, and Mariamne soon assuaged the wrath of Herod: but happening to reply to some expression of his affection, that his having given orders to put her to death, was no proof of love, this betrayal of his secret instructions, convinced Herod of the truth of the charge of illicit intercourse with Joseph, and it was with difficulty that he restrained himself from ordering her immediate death: Joseph, however, was instantly executed without being heard in his defence.

Execution of Joseph.

Judæa seems to have recovered rapidly under the government of Herod from the effects of the war with Antigonus; for we find the

[1] *Antiq.* lib. xv. c. 3.
[2] *De Bell. Jud.* lib. i. c. 22, s. 4. *Antiq.* lib. xv. c. 3.

B. C. 31. new king prepared to assist Antony, both with supplies of men and money for the war, which terminated in his defeat at Actium.[1] Antony, however, declined accepting his reinforcement. The fall of Antony was justly a cause of alarm to Herod:[2] his friends despaired of his safety; his attachment to the rival of Augustus was commonly known; and his enemies rejoiced at the prospect of his ruin. We cannot but lament, that one who could prepare himself for that interview with Augustus, upon which his life and fortune depended, with such admirable firmness and discretion, should have taken measures, in the event of his death, to involve others in his ruin. On his departure, he committed Alexandra and Mariamne to the custody of his friend, Soemus, with orders that neither of them should be permitted to survive the event of his death, lest the spirit of Alexandra should disturb the settlement of the chief power in the hands of his children. His conduct showed a mixture of folly with cruelty; for had Augustus punished him with dethronement or death, for his attachment to Antony, there remained not the slightest probability either that the conqueror would set a descendant of Herod on the throne, or that his family, even if supported by the whole nation, could have maintained their power for an instant against the will of Augustus. At Rhodes, Herod met Augustus, whom he addressed in the tone of a man conscious of having displayed towards his friend a fidelity which, in the judgment of all good men, was in the highest degree praiseworthy: he did not palliate his conduct, but seemed rather to lament that the assistance in money and provisions which he had afforded to his unfortunate ally was, if possible, less than his duty required. He represented that he had been prevented from joining actively in the war, but that he had done all that was in his power to advance the best interests of his friend, and that if Antony had taken his advice, and put Cleopatra aside, he might still have lived, and have been reconciled to Augustus. He proceeded then to state of himself, that from his fidelity to Antony, Augustus might judge of his general disposition to his friends; for that such as he was to Antony, he was also to all those to whom he was bound by the ties of gratitude and affection. Such openness and generosity, seconded by liberal presents, both to Augustus, and all who were about the person of the conqueror, obtained for Herod the safety of his person, and the security of his kingdom; the possession of which was confirmed to him by a second decree of the Senate. He returned to Judæa with honour and success, confounding the hopes of his enemies, who beheld him as it were gaining power from each danger which appeared to threaten him. Augustus soon after passed through Judæa on his road to Egypt, and was attended by Herod, who presented him with the immense sum of 800 talents,[3] and furnished him with such profusion as to make men suspect that he must exhaust the strength of his kingdom. By this means, however, he gave assurance of his

B. C. 30. Interview with Augustus.

Profuse supplies to Augustus.

[1] *Antiq.* lib. xv. c. 5. [2] Ibid. c. 6. [3] Ibid. s. 7.

fidelity, and by being splendidly liberal in proportion to the necessity of the occasion, succeeded in producing that impression on the mind of Augustus which he desired. B. C. 30.

In the absence of Herod, the remembrance of the orders formerly given to Joseph, naturally made Alexandra and Mariamne suspicious of the king's designs towards them. They found at first a difficulty in inducing Soemus to betray the confidence which the king had reposed in him; but the intreaties of his prisoners, the kind presents with which they flattered his pride, united to his own belief of the impossibility of Herod's safe return, by degrees undermined his fidelity, and he revealed the orders for their destruction, which had again been given. Herod, however, returned, and naturally expected that none would rejoice so much at the happy result of his interview with Augustus, as the wife whom he so much loved. But he found to his surprise, that neither the relation of the dangers which he had escaped, nor the honours which he had received, excited the least interest in her bosom. Hate and love by turns distracted him: at one moment he determined to punish her with death; at the next his passion returned, and disarmed his intention of its cruelty. The state of Herod's mind could not be concealed from his mother and from his sister Salome, who viewed with barbarous exultation the changed temper of the king, as affording them the fairest opportunity of revenging upon Alexandra and Mariamne, some words which they had contemptuously spoken against the family of Herod. The moral conduct of Mariamne was wholly irreproachable; she was faithful and chaste, but there was somewhat haughty and severe in her natural disposition; and in the imperious manner which she used towards her husband, she seemed to take advantage of the blindness of his love, and to forget that, though his wife, she was still subject to his power. She sometimes conducted herself with a degree of insolence towards the king, and often spoke reproachfully of his mother and his sister, thereby sowing the seeds of irreconcileable dissensions between herself and the female branches of Herod's family. The discord between Herod and Mariamne had continued a whole year after his return from Augustus. It happened one day that the king, retiring to rest about noon, sought her company: she came, but instead of requiting his love with corresponding affection, she reproached him with the murder of her father and her brother. The king naturally was indignant, but his anger might have passed away,[1] had not Salome seized the opportunity which she had long sought, to excite him to severity against his wife, by suborning his cup-bearer to assert that Mariamne had bribed him to give the king a certain potion, the nature of which, however, he knew not. Herod, anxious to learn its nature, put to the rack the eunuch most in confidence with his wife, thinking he must be aware of her intentions. Nothing, however, was discovered from the eunuch, relating to the potion; but he said the cause of Mariamne's hatred

Intrigues of Salome against Mariamne.

[1] *Antiq.* lib. xv. c. 7.

B. C. 30. was her knowledge of the orders with which Soemus had been intrusted. The king had such an high opinion of the fidelity of this officer, that he was persuaded that nothing but an illicit intercourse with Mariamne could have wrung from him the secret of his orders. Soemus was therefore ordered to instant execution; but Herod would not condemn his wife without the appearance at least of a regular sentence: he therefore summoned his most familiar friends, and accused her of administering the potion. The result was a sentence of death; which the tender weakness of Herod commuted into imprisonment. Salome, however, persuaded the king that the death of Mariamne was necessary to secure himself against the tumults of the populace; and by her advice she was led away to execution. On her way to the fatal spot, she had the additional pain of seeing her own mother, under the influence of terror, burst forth into the midst of the crowd, and load her with reproaches for her ungrateful conduct to her husband. How much Alexandra had excited her own daughter to behave contemptuously towards Herod was known to all; and men beheld with pity and astonishment, the dissimulation to which the fear of partaking her daughter's punishment had driven the wretched mother. Mariamne uttered not a word, nor betrayed the slightest emotion at this desertion by her parent, but displayed in death a firmness of character which corresponded to her noble birth. Herod, however, soon felt all the miseries of a wounded conscience, increased by the remembrance of ardent love. He was often heard to call Mariamne by name, his lamentations were unrestrained, he sought for pleasure in frequent banquets, but it fled from him; until at last he declined all regard to public business, and so forgot himself at times, as to order his servants to fetch Mariamne, as if she were yet alive. A pestilential disorder at this time prevailed, which took off in its ravages many of his friends. Under pretence of enjoying the amusements of the chase, he retired from society, and passed his days sorrowing in solitude. In a short time, the sufferings of his mind brought on him a fever and delirium, which baffled the skill of his physicians; who, finding all remedies ineffectual, left him to his fate. Whilst labouring under this disorder, the king resided at Samaria. That he should recover from such an illness, appeared to be impossible. Alexandra, therefore, lost no time in preparing measures to secure to herself the chief command, in the event of his death, and made proposals to the officers who were intrusted with the two forts in Jerusalem, which commanded the Temple and the city, that for the sake of security under the present calamity of the king's illness, they should deliver up the charge to herself and to Herod's sons. The officers were faithful to Herod, and sent him intelligence of Alexandra's proposal. The result was the immediate execution of Alexandra.

B. C. 29.

Execution of Mariamne.

Remorse of Herod.

Treason and execution of Alexandra.

B. C. 28. In process of time Herod recovered from his illness, and a remarkable change took place in his conduct:[1] he threw off the mask of

[1] *Antiq.* lib. xv. c. 8. *De Bell. Jud.* lib. i. c. 21.

religion, and laboured zealously to remove all the prejudices of the Jews in favour of the law of Moses, by introducing among them the customs of heathen nations. All his views seem to have been henceforth directed to Romanize Judæa. He instituted quinquennial games in honour of Augustus; he built a theatre and an amphitheatre on a scale of the greatest magnificence at Jerusalem. Competitors for the prizes which he proposed to those who excelled in gymnastic exercises, came from all parts. The chariot and the horse race were contested for rewards of no inconsiderable value. The most celebrated musicians were invited to contend for victory. In the amphitheatre, he exhibited animals for the entertainment of the populace; and, to complete the picture of a Roman festival, gladiators fought with wild beasts and with each other, to the horror of the pious Jews, who regarded such shedding of blood as a pollution of the land. But the sight of these cruel sports, so strange to the Jewish nation, did not excite their anger so much as the trophies which were erected in the circus, representing the nations which Augustus had subjected to the Roman power. The resemblance of the trophy to the human form, made them regard these emblems as idolatrous representations of the Divinity; and it was not until Herod had stripped the trophies of their ornaments, and shown of what material they were composed, that they were reconciled to their introduction into the city.

B. C. 26. Herod introduces heathen customs. Public games at Jerusalem.

The designs which the king had manifestly formed against their religion, and his violation of every custom dear to the Jews, were, however, considered by many as sure forerunners of still more dreadful evils. Herod was, in name, their king, but, in deed, the enemy of their country and their God. Ten men, zealous for the law, conspired to assassinate him in the theatre. The plan was discovered, and the conspirators were arrested, with daggers concealed about their persons. They were not ashamed of their designs, but boldly confessed their intentions, and were led away to execution.

Plot for the assassination of Herod. B. C. 25.

Herod now understood the feelings of the people, and found it necessary to increase his fortifications for the security of his own person, and to provide against rebellions. In the city he had two fortresses, the palace and the castle of Antonia, so named in honour of Antony: he now planned the restoration of Samaria, and fortified it, probably as a balance to the strength of Jerusalem; for he not only rebuilt it, but peopled it with inhabitants, calling it Sebaste, in honour of Augustus, and erecting a temple, which he dedicated to Cæsar. These fortresses, with many others, were built for safety; but to increase the prosperity of his kingdom by trade, he entertained the grand design of converting the tower of Strato into a city and seaport. He formed an artificial harbour with moles, and defended it by a breakwater, surrounding the port with a wall and towers of defence. Few places presented more obstacles; but the skill and the munificence of Herod surmounted them all. The honour of this great work he sedulously declined ascribing to himself, and the names of Cæsar

His precautions for his personal safety.

His magnificent public works.

B. C. 25. and of Cæsar's friends were everywhere indelibly affixed. The most conspicuous tower in the port was called *Drusium*, in honour of Drusus, the son-in-law of Augustus; and in the splendid temple which he dedicated to Cæsar, a colossal statue of Augustus, like that of the Olympian Jove, was erected, and near it another as great as that of the Argive Juno, being a female figure, representing the city of Rome. Twelve years were occupied in these stupendous works; but it was not in Cæsarea and Sebaste alone that he flattered Augustus. At Jerusalem he named two courts or wings of his palace *Cæsarium* and *Agrippium*. At the source of the Jordan, called *Panium*, another temple arose in honour of his benefactor. At Jericho, in the palace which he there constructed, the names of Cæsar and Agrippa were again honourably attached to the buildings; and, as Josephus emphatically states, there was not a single place in the whole country worthy such distinction wherein the name of Cæsar was not conspicuous. It is, indeed, sufficiently evident that the policy which Herod pursued, and by which he retained a perfect sovereignty over Judæa, was that of paying the most flattering court to Augustus. The forbidding character of the Jewish religion was well known to the Romans; but Herod sought their favour by the most public renunciation of every Jewish prejudice, and the adoption of every custom that could do honour to his protectors. He seems studiously to have laboured to convince foreign nations that he was the king of Judea, but that he was not himself one of the despised and prejudiced race of Jews; that he had no narrow-minded views of religion, but was ready to patronize every opinion which other nations held: to this spirit we may ascribe his contribution of money for the restoration of the Olympic games, as well as his erection of theatres and temples to heathen deities at Tyre, Sidon, Berytus, and Damascus. Josephus asserts that his bounty was experienced by innumerable cities both in Asia Minor, and also in Greece; and that he was in many cases restrained from doing as he wished, only by the fear lest those to whom the sovereignty of the states belonged, should be jealous of the patronage which he extended to their subjects.[1] The sums which Herod expended in building cities and fortresses must have been immense; but he took care to prevent the Romans from interrupting the completion of his designs, by making his dedications to Augustus, seem so many public testimonies of his dependence upon the emperor. In many instances, however, the structures which he erected were monuments to the memory of those whom he loved. The city Antipatris he built as a testimony of his affection to his father; and dedicated to his mother's memory a magnificent castle at Jericho, which after her was called Cyprion. The tower of Phasael and Hippicus, in the circuit of the walls of Jerusalem, were lasting memorials of fraternal and of friendly affection; nor was his love to the unfortunate Mariamne forgotten, for the fairest tower in the walls bore her name.

[1] *De Bell. Jud.* lib. i. c. 21, s. 12.

Herod was a prince, who seems to have had no rule of conduct, but that arising from a sense of political interest. The reasons which led him to undertake the stupendous work of rebuilding the Temple at Jerusalem may be traced in the accounts left us by Josephus of the state of the public mind a short time before he commenced this great work.[1] Herod's prosperity was at its height during the visit of Augustus to Syria, when his sons were still at Rome, under the care of the emperor; and when the increase of his territory, by the acquisition of the district, called the House of Zenodorus, proved the confidence which Augustus reposed in him.[2] All his foreign success was gained by compliance with heathen customs. And when the indignation of the Jews at his conduct began to display itself in open murmurs, Herod at first strove to suppress the feelings of the people by a most rigid and vexatious system of police, prohibiting persons from walking or conversing together; himself, in private dress, condescending to be the spy upon the common people, and filling the whole country with emissaries, who were employed to watch the expression of any the slightest feeling of hostility. By persecution and imprisonment he endeavoured to force men to compliance with the customs which he prescribed, and thought to ensure the obedience of the people by administering to them an oath of fidelity to his person. Many consented to the oath from private attachment to him, or from fear; but the Pharisees and the Essenes boldly refused, and Herod is said to have ceased from enforcing his orders out of respect to Pollio and Manahem, the respective leaders of these sects. When he had thus tried in vain to subdue the feelings of his countrymen, he perceived that it would be better to yield entirely to their prejudices; and in proof of his good will to their religion, he undertook to rebuild the Temple on the greatest scale of magnificence. In a set oration he exposed his designs to them; but so great was their unwillingness to undertake the execution of such vast plans, as well as their suspicion lest the building, once begun, should remain unfinished, that Herod found himself obliged to make all his preparations for the erection of the new Temple, before he could venture upon removing a single stone of the old structure. The construction of that part of the former building which strictly constituted the Temple, and which comprehended the porch, the holy place, and the holy of holies, occupied a period of not more than eighteen months; but the porticoes and other works surrounding the Temple were not completed until the lapse of a further space of eight years. From the accounts of Josephus,[3] it is evident that Herod did not leave any part of the Temple standing which had been erected on the return of the Jews from Babylon. The structure was entirely new, even from the foundation, and both in size and extent greatly exceeded the ancient building. And though it is said that Herod finished it in nine years and a half, it is probable

B. C. 25. Rebuilding of the Temple.

B. C. 21.

B. C. 20.

B. C. 19.

[1] *Antiq.* lib. xv. c. 10, s. 4. [2] *De Bell. Jud.* lib. i. c. 20, s. 4.
[3] *Antiq.* lib. xv. c. 11. *De Bell. Jud.* lib. i. c. 21, s. 1.

B. C. 19. that this *finishing* amounted to little more than the rude completion of the plan, the more exact adorning of the building occupying a much longer time. This appears both from *John* ii. 20, where we read of the disciples speaking to our Lord, "Forty and six years hath this temple been building," and also from *Antiq.* xx. 8, where it is related, that whilst Gessius Florus was governor of Judæa the works were completed, and eighteen thousand artificers were discharged, who had been engaged up to that time.

B. C. 25. Famine in Judæa.

In the thirteenth year of Herod's reign a dreadful famine visited Judæa and Syria, attended with all the misery and disease which fail not to accompany a time of dearth.[1] The conduct of the king on this occasion was of the most noble description; and had not his crimes stamped the indelible brand of tyranny upon his memory, the sacrifices which he then made would have ranked him among those kings who had been benefactors to their subjects. To supply the wants of his people, he stripped his palaces of every ornament of silver and gold, of everything, however precious its material or costly its workmanship, and loading a vessel with these spoils he sent it to Egypt to purchase corn. Benevolence such as this could not fail to conciliate the affections of his countrymen, and to diminish the hatred which they had cherished against him for his violation of their customs: the kindness which he displayed in this season of distress, for the time quite changed the temper of the multitude, who no longer judged of him by the past, but considered his present conduct as a proof of the natural mildness of his disposition.

Exertions of Herod to relieve it.

In justice to Herod, we must not omit to mention the kind assistance which he gave to the Jewish colonists of Asia Minor, and his successful preservation of those privileges which had in former times been extended to them. In the expedition which Agrippa made against the inhabitants of the Cimmerian Bosporus Herod bore a part; and after the business of the campaign had been accomplished, they returned together through Asia Minor.[2] In Ionia they were met by a great company of Jews, who came to request from Agrippa a release from the exactions which they suffered, and a restitution of the privileges which had been confirmed to them by the Romans. They complained of injury, in that they were hindered from living under their own laws; that they could not keep their sabbaths, being compelled on those days to attend the courts of justice; that they were robbed of the money which they collected for the purpose of transmitting to the Temple at Jerusalem; were forced to serve in the army, to accept public offices, and to expend in such services their sacred treasures. Herod requested the attention of Agrippa to the complaint, and obtained permission for Nicolaus Damascenus to plead the cause of the Jews; a task which he performed so eloquently, that he obtained from Agrippa a full confirmation of all the privileges of which his countrymen had been deprived.

B. C. 14. Joint expedition of Herod and Agrippa.

[1] *Antiq.* lib. xv. c. 9.

[2] Ibid. lib. xvi. c. 2.

With the exception of the events of the last two or three years of his life, these are nearly all the public acts of Herod. The dreadful troubles which arose from the dissensions of his family, and which certainly hastened his death, compose a tragical story, the parallel to which scarcely occurs in history. The particulars of it are related by Josephus at great length;[1] we shall not, however, enter into minute details of the intrigues of female malice, but content ourselves with a brief narration of the facts, which stigmatize Herod as the murderer of his sons. In many respects, Herod does not appear to have been wanting in natural affection; but when his personal interest or the maintenance of his authority appeared to clash with his love to his children, his ungovernable passions quickly overcame the dictates of nature and of justice. By Mariamne he had two sons, Alexander and Aristobulus, whom he treated with affection, purposing to leave his dominions as an inheritance to one or both of them. His care in sending them at an early age to Rome for education, and introducing them to the notice of Augustus, bears upon the face of it marks of parental fondness; and his taking a journey to Rome to visit Augustus, and to bring back his children to Judæa, on the completion of their education in the Roman court, has every appearance of the pride of a father who was happy to receive his children from the hands of a prince, to whose charge they had been intrusted; and at the same time desirous to make amends by his kindness to them for the injuries he had inflicted upon their mother. The return of the young men to Judæa was a cause of great public joy; but to Salome, and to all those who had borne a part in the condemnation of Mariamne, the popularity of the young princes, and their ascendancy over their father, occasioned the most painful reflections upon the past, accompanied with forebodings of certain punishment. They saw no way of escape, but in striving to alienate from them the affection of Herod; and for this purpose they sedulously spread reports that the young men disliked their father, and regarded him in no other light than as the murderer of their mother. While they were thus employed, Herod was absent with Agrippa in Asia Minor; and, on his return, Salome, and Pheroras, who shared in her design, communicated to the king the dangers to be apprehended from the revengeful temper of Mariamne's sons. Herod was exceedingly afflicted at this intelligence; and, unhappily, the course which he pursued was such as could not fail to aggravate any feelings of resentment which Alexander and Aristobulus might actually entertain. Herod had a son, Antipater, by his first wife Doris, born before he ascended the throne, whom he now sent for to court, thinking, by paying him honour, to depress the spirit of the two princes. But the elevation of their half-brother was received by the other princes as a direct injury, of which they openly complained. Antipater was a man of the blackest disposition: he seized every opportunity to irritate Herod against the sons of Mariamne. The more they complained,

B. C. 14.

History of the sons of Herod.

B. C. 16.

Salome conspires against them.

B. C. 14.

Rise of Antipater.

B. C. 13.

[1] *Antiq.* lib. xvi. c. 2. *De Bell. Jud.* lib. i. c. 23–27.

B. C. 13. the more honour did the king confer upon his new favourite; and at last, on the return of Agrippa from Asia, he committed Antipater to his charge, to convey him to Rome, and introduce him to Augustus. Antipater, whilst at Rome, wrote frequent letters to exasperate the king, and to excite in his mind fears of safety from the designs of the two brothers; till Herod determined to take his sons with him to Rome, and there to accuse them before Cæsar. Augustus condescended to hear the charge; but Alexander defended himself so eloquently, that all the assembly, as well as Augustus, were moved with compassion; and, by the emperor's advice, a reconciliation was effected. Antipater was enough master of his feelings to appear as one who heartily shared in the universal joy. Herod and his three sons returned home together; and, having received anew from Augustus the privilege of appointing his successor, he conferred on each of them the same royal honours, in the hope that, by this equality, each might be induced to conduct himself with propriety in the prospect of becoming

B. C. 9. the successor to the crown. For some time the brothers appear to have agreed together; but Antipater was only watching an opportunity to effect his malicious purposes. The family of Herod presented, alternately, the appearance of union and division—of affection and distrust: at length the king, excited by the arts of Antipater and Salome, and no longer doubtful that his sons were plotting against him, sought and obtained permission to accuse them before a Roman Council at Berytus. There were met together on this occasion the Roman governors of Syria, the members of Herod's family, and a hundred and fifty chief persons of Syria. Before this assembly Herod accused his sons with all the vehemence of a bitter enemy; but the whole charge in proof against the two princes did not amount to any conspiracy or malice against their father, but only consisted of some reproachful speeches which they had uttered. The princes were not allowed to answer to the accusation. Saturninus and others gave it as their opinions that the power of life and death over his sons should be confirmed to Herod, yet that their crimes did not deserve the punishment of death; but Volumnius and others, who were the majority, decreed that the princes deserved to die; and the consequences of this sentence were so clearly seen, that from that moment the young men were regarded in no other light than as persons under actual sentence of death.

Trial of Alexander and Aristobulus.

Herod did not act immediately upon the decision of the Council; but, after a short time, having learned what interest was taken by the people in the fate of the two princes, he became fully convinced of the guilt of his sons, and gave orders for their death. Antipater had now succeeded in removing out of the way the sons of Mariamne; but, fearful lest Herod should live long enough to discover the part he had taken against his brothers, he determined at once to plot his father's destruction. Pheroras, Herod's brother, and all the females of the family of Herod, Salome excepted, were willing to assist the

Their execution.

ulterior designs of this ambitious prince. The conspiracy, however, did not escape the notice of Salome, who watched their meetings, and gave constant intelligence to Herod of the dangers which surrounded him. B. C. 9. Conspiracy of Antipater.

It was at length resolved by the conspirators to despatch Herod by poison; but Antipater, fearful of discovery, procured a summons from Augustus to Rome, that, being out of the way when the attempt should be made, he might be the less suspected of participation in the murder. Herod soon after fell sick, and sent to Pheroras to come and see him; but he refused, on the ground that he had vowed never more to see him while alive. The king, however, did not requite his conduct in the same manner; for, in the last sickness with which his brother was soon attacked, Herod visited him unsent for, and at his death honoured him with a splendid funeral at Jerusalem. The death of Pheroras proved the ruin of Antipater; for the king, having been informed that he had been poisoned by his wife, set on foot the most strict investigation; and, after putting several persons to the torture, discovered the plot which had been arranged for his own destruction by Antipater and Pheroras. The whole investigation of this affair occupied a space of seven months; but so great was the detestation of the people towards Antipater, and so carefully were the avenues of information watched, that he was kept in entire ignorance of all the discoveries which had taken place during his absence at Rome. In the mean time Bathyllus, one of his freedmen, arrived from Rome with letters. When put to the torture, he confessed that he brought poison for Doris, Antipater's mother, and Pheroras to use, in case the former potion should have proved ineffectual to despatch the king. Antipater himself soon returned, and reached Sebaste before he suspected that his share in the conspiracy had been discovered, and that he must prepare to make his defence before Varus and the Council. The accusation was first made by Herod, and proceeded in by Nicolaus Damascenus. No proofs of guilt could be stronger than those produced against him. Having been condemned and thrown into prison, an embassy was despatched to Cæsar to acquaint him with the conviction of the accused, and to request his final decision of the case. His trial.

Whilst the embassy was at Rome, Herod fell sick;[1] and Judas and Matthias, who were the chief among the teachers of the Law, in the belief that he could not recover, excited the people to throw down the golden eagle, which the king had, contrary to the laws and customs of the nation, erected over the Temple. The conspirators were seized; and Herod, though now so ill as to be unable to sit up, assembled the members of his Council. They disclaimed any approval of the transaction, and recommended that the authors of it should be punished; upon which Herod gave orders to burn alive Matthias and all who were concerned in the affair. It is recorded that, on the night of the execution, there was an eclipse of the moon, B. C. 4.

[1] *De Bell. Jud.* lib. i. c. 33.

B. C. 4. Sickness of Herod.

a circumstance which serves to fix the date of this event. Herod's disease soon after became more violent; his sufferings were painful in the extreme; attended with ulcerations in the lower parts of the body, and strong convulsions. He was recommended by his physicians to try the warm baths at Callirrhoe; but not finding any benefit, he returned to Jericho. His torments, instead of moving him to repentance, seemed rather to excite anew the cruelty of his temper; for, having collected together the chiefs of the Jewish nation, he shut them up in the Hippodrome at Jericho, and gave orders to Salome, as soon as he should be dead, to put them all to death; lest, in the joy at his decease, mourners should be wanted for his funeral. In the meanwhile the ambassadors returned from Rome, and brought the permission of Cæsar for the punishment of Antipater, either by exile or by death. The pleasure which Herod derived from the success of his embassy, for the moment, revived him; but his pains soon returned with such violence, that he made an attempt to commit suicide. The alarm created by the event ran through the palace, and was heard by Antipater, who, concluding that his father's death occasioned it, endeavoured to bribe the gaoler to permit his escape; but the man was faithful to his trust, and communicated the proposal to the king, who immediately gave orders for his death, attaching to it a command to bury him in an ignoble manner at Hyrcanium. Herod then, once again, made his will, giving the kingdom of Judæa to Archelaus; the tetrarchy of Galilee and Peræa to Antipas; Gaulonitis, Trachonitis, and Batanea to Philip; and the cities Jamnia, Azotus, and Phasaelis, besides very considerable sums of money, to Salome. To every one of his relations he bequeathed handsome estates and legacies, leaving them in the possession of affluent wealth; and his legacies to Augustus and his wife Julia were worthy the acceptance of the chiefs of the Roman empire.

Execution of Antipater.

Death of Herod.

On the fifth day after the death of Antipater, Herod died, having reigned thirty-four years from the death of Antigonus, and thirty-seven from the time of his investment by the Romans. Before the report of his death was noised abroad, Salome and Alexas dismissed those who were imprisoned in the Hippodrome; but as soon as the event was known they assembled the soldiery in the amphitheatre, and read to them the will of Herod. The troops proclaimed Archelaus king, and rent the air with shouts of joy and prayers for his prosperous reign.

His character.

Josephus (xvii. 8) thus sums up the character of Herod: "He was a man universally cruel, and of an ungovernable anger; and though he trampled justice under foot, he was ever the favourite of fortune. From a private station he rose to the throne. Beset on every side with a thousand dangers, he escaped them all, and prolonged his life to the full boundary of old age. They who considered what befel him in the bosom of his own family pronounced him a man most miserable; but to himself he ever seemed most prosperous,

for of all his enemies there was not one whom he did not overcome." B. C. 3.
Such is the history of a prince, whose name is familiar to us from our childhood as the first persecutor of our blessed Lord, and the murderer of the infants at Bethlehem, events which will be considered in a more fitting place. The account here given of the transactions of his life will evince that if, according to the judgment of the world, he who reigns splendidly and fortunately, in spite of all the difficulties opposed to his government, be entitled to the attribute of Greatness, that appellation has not been unjustly bestowed upon Herod.

CHAPTER V.

HISTORY OF THE JEWS FROM THE DEATH OF HEROD THE GREAT TO THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM.

FROM B. C. 3 TO A. D. 70.

B. C. 3. THE death of Herod the Great left Judæa virtually without a governor,
State of public opinion on the death of Herod. the will of the late king requiring to be confirmed by Augustus, before Archelaus could inherit the crown bequeathed to him by his father.[1] The army and the court readily admitted the title of Archelaus to the throne, and the people at large were willing to purchase promises of future favours by demonstrations of present loyalty; for a few days nothing therefore was perceived but expressions of joy. The weak hold upon the government which Archelaus possessed, presented a favourable opportunity to the friends of Judas and Matthias, and of those whom Herod had put to death for throwing down the golden eagle, to demand from him the revenge of this innocent blood. The fate of Judas and Matthias was purposely made the subject of public lamentation by their friends, who assembled in the Temple at the time of the Passover, and there bewailed the death of their leaders and the cruelty of Herod. Archelaus, well aware of the necessity of hastening speedily to Rome, was unwilling at first to attempt to repress by force the manifestation of these feelings; but the increasing boldness of the party determined him to adopt decided measures. A
Massacre in the Temple. centurion was commanded to arrest the ringleaders in the Temple, the multitude protected them against the soldiers; upon which Archelaus with his whole army surrounded the Temple, and attacked the assembled people, 3,000 of whom were put to death. A general dismay pervaded the city, and a proclamation for every one to depart from Jerusalem and to break up the feast was immediately obeyed. After such a proof of the severity of Archelaus, we cannot wonder
Matt. ii. 22. at the narration of St. Matthew respecting the fears entertained by Joseph on his return from Egypt, "who, when he heard that Archelaus reigned in Judæa in the room of his father Herod, was afraid to go thither."

Archelaus visits Rome. After the Passover, Archelaus proceeded to Rome, attended by Herod Antipas and the chief members of his family.[2] From motives either of fear or of jealousy the family of Herod used every exertion to defeat the pretensions of Archelaus, and to procure a grant of the kingdom in favour of Antipas. The whole nation of the Jews appear at this time to have been weary of a despotic government; for whilst

[1] Josephus, *de Bell. Jud.* lib. ii. c. 1. *Antiq.* lib. xvii. c. 8.
[2] *Antiq.* lib. xvii. c. 9. *De Bell. Jud.* lib. ii. c. 2.

Archelaus was at Rome, an embassy arrived there from Judæa, to solicit from Augustus the reduction of the kingdom to the form of a Roman province; a measure which would have been very gratifying to a body of 8,000 Jews then resident at Rome, and to none more than to all the members of Herod's family, whose desire for the advancement of Antipas arose solely out of dislike to Archelaus. The Jews accused Archelaus of assuming the royal authority without the sanction of Augustus, and urged against him his cruel and unjustifiable attack upon the people at the Passover. Augustus heard the charges which were answered on the part of Archelaus by Nicolaus Damascenus[1] (an orator whose services in the affairs of Herod the Great have been before mentioned); and shortly afterwards[2] confirmed the appointments of Herod's will, by committing the government of Judæa to Archelaus, with the inferior title of Ethnarch. That of king was promised as a future reward, if he should prove himself worthy a higher distinction. A. D. 3. Appointed Ethnarch of Judæa.

The dominions allotted to Archelaus included Judæa, Samaria, and Idumæa; the remainder of the territories of Herod the Great were formed into two tetrarchies, that containing Galilee and Peræa was given to Herod Antipas; the other, which comprised Batanea, Trachonitis, and Auranitis, to Philip, who is described by St. Luke as tetrarch of Iturea and of the region of Trachonitis. A comparative judgment of the power thus intrusted to these three princes may be formed from their respective revenues. That of Archelaus amounted to 400 talents,[3] of Herod to 200, and of Philip to 100. A palace at Ascalon, with three cities, Jamnia, Azotus, and Phasaelis, producing 60 talents yearly, became the portion of Salome, the sister of Herod the Great, the civil jurisdiction of these cities being reserved to Archelaus. Distribution of Herod's dominions.

Whilst the Jewish embassy was labouring to procure the reduction of Judæa to the condition of a Roman province, their countrymen experienced some of the evils attendant upon that form of government. In the division of the provinces of the empire, which were allotted to Augustus, and termed *Provinciæ Imperatoriæ*, that of Cœle-Syria was included. In each of these imperial provinces the officer next in rank to the governor was called the *Procurator Cæsaris*, and was charged with the entire management of the revenue. Sabinus was at this time *Procurator* in Cœle-Syria, a man of unprincipled habits and avaricious temper, who made the duty of protecting the interests of Cæsar a pretext for plunder, and occasioned disturbances in Jerusalem, which proceeded to an alarming extent. On the death of Herod,[4] Sabinus was hastening to Jerusalem to take charge on the behalf of Augustus of all the late king's treasure and effects. Archelaus availed himself Abuses of the Procurator Sabinus.

[1] *Antiq.* lib. xvii. c. 11.
[2] *De Bell. Jud.* lib. ii. c. 6. *Antiq.* lib. xvii. c. 13.
[3] *Antiq.* lib. xvii. c. 13, 14; 600 talents. *De Bell. Jud.* lib. ii. c. 6; 400.
[4] *De Bell. Jud.* lib. ii. c. 2. *Antiq.* lib. xvii. c. 12.

A. D. 3. of the kind interposition of Varus, the Roman governor, to stop his proceedings; but no sooner had Archelaus departed to Rome, than Sabinus went up to Jerusalem, seized the palace, and required the officers of Herod both to give an account of the treasures in their hands, and to surrender the strong places in their charge: to these demands compliance was universally refused, and the officers excused themselves by saying that they held these places more for Cæsar than for Archelaus.

Tumults in Jerusalem,

The foresight of Varus had furnished Jerusalem with one of the three legions of the province, a force sufficient to have repressed any ordinary tumult, had not his precaution been defeated by the madness and misconduct of Sabinus, who, not content with irritating the minds of the people by publicly displaying himself attended by his guards, attempted to obtain forcible possession of the royal treasures. At the Feast of Pentecost, when the feelings of the people were displayed in open hostility against the Roman soldiers, the Temple was forced by the troops, the porticoes were burnt, and the treasury was plundered. From its spoils Sabinus was not ashamed to appropriate to himself

and the rest of Judæa.

no less a sum than 400 talents.[1] These tumults in Jerusalem were the signal for universal disorder. In the anarchy which then arose, numerous robber-chieftains attached to themselves large bodies of the people, and assuming the title of kings, plundered the country around.[2]

Conjecture as to Theudas.

It is probable that the Theudas,[3] who is mentioned in the speech of Gamaliel (Acts v. 36), as having made an insurrection and placed himself at the head of a party, in the time prior to the rise of the sect of Judas of Galilee, was one of these persons, or at least that he followed the example which they had given in the interval between these troubles and those which arose from the taxing of Cyrenius.

Punishment of the insurgents.

The attack made upon the Temple by Sabinus roused the people to a vigorous resistance, and the Roman legion was in imminent danger of perishing in the palace, now besieged by the multitude, when it was rescued by the arrival of Varus with the whole army of the province. Sabinus ashamed of his conduct retired privately from the city. This decisive movement of Varus once more restored peace. Many of the conspirators were taken, and 2,000 of the most guilty were crucified.[4] Of 10,000 who surrendered in Idumæa, the principal leaders were sent to Rome for the judgment of Augustus. Some of them were pardoned, whilst others who were of the kindred of Herod were put to death as persons who had rebelled against their king. Varus, having settled these disturbances, returned to Antioch, leaving one legion in garrison at Jerusalem. Of the acts of Archelaus, during his reign, no particulars are recorded, except his twice deposing the High-priest, and building a city called Archelais. All that we

[1] *De Bell. Jud.* lib. ii. c. 3. *Antiq.* lib. xvii. c. 12.
[2] *De Bell. Jud.* lib. ii. c. 4. *Antiq.* lib. xvii. c. 12.
[3] Lardner's *Credibility*, part i. b. ii. c. vii.
[4] *De Bell. Jud.* lib. ii. c. 5.

learn from Josephus[1] and from Dion Cassius, amounts only to this, that having been accused by his own family and countrymen of cruelty and misgovernment, he was banished by Augustus to Vienne, in Gaul. This event is placed by Dion Cassius in the consulship of Lepidus and Arruntius, U. C. 759. A. D. 6.[2]

A. D. 3. Banishment of Archelaus.

A. D. 6.

The history of Philip and Herod Antipas, the two sons of Herod the Great, who shared with Archelaus in the division of their father's kingdom, derives its sole importance from their being persons whose names are recorded in the gospel. Of Philip, whom we have before mentioned as possessing the tetrarchy of Trachonitis, nothing more is related by Josephus,[3] than the fact that he governed the country for thirty-seven years, and that, dying in the twentieth year of Tiberius, he left no heirs. He was an amiable and just prince. His only public acts were the building of the cities Cæsarea, Philippi, and Julias, in the latter of which he was buried. On his death, the government of the tetrarchy was attached to the province of Cœle-Syria, but the collection of the revenue remained distinct.

Reign of Philip, Tetrarch of Trachonitis.

A. D. 33. U. C. 786.

In the fate of Herod Antipas, tetrarch of Galilee,[4] we take a greater interest, on account of his name being frequently mentioned in the gospels, and his being known to us as the prince who put John the Baptist to death, and who examined and insulted our blessed Lord on the morning of his crucifixion.[5] The immediate cause of the murder of the Baptist, is stated by Josephus to have been the jealousy entertained by Herod of the influence which John had gained over the minds of the people, who seemed prepared to perform whatever the Baptist would command. But the Evangelist ascribes his death to the anger of Herodias, who would not forgive him for opposing her unlawful marriage with Herod, the brother of her husband. Ample traces of the Baptist's authority and influence may be discerned in what is affirmed by St. Luke (iii. 10) concerning the common people, the publicans, and even the soldiers applying to him as their spiritual

Reign of Herod Antipas, Tetrarch of Galilee.

Murder of John the Baptist.

[1] *Antiq.* lib. xvii. c. 15.

[2] There is some difficulty in ascertaining the exact duration of Archelaus's reign. Josephus (*Antiq.* lib. xvii. c. 15) mentions his being accused to Augustus in the tenth year of his reign; and at the commencement of "*his Life*" relates that his father was born in the tenth year of the reign of Archelaus. But in *de Bell. Jud.* lib. ii. c. 7, the banishment is placed in the ninth year of his reign. The difficulty is solved by Mr. Benson, in his *Treatise on the Chronology of Christ*, p. 50, in the following manner:—The *Book of Antiquities* being written for the Jews, the Jewish method of computation is preserved in it; according to which, the years of their kings are dated from the month Nisan, so that if an accession takes place in any month prior to Nisan, that portion of the year forms the first year of the reign. If then Archelaus came to the crown before Nisan of 4711, Jewish Period, and was banished after Nisan in 4719, Jewish Period, it would be correct, according to their computation, to say that the event took place in the tenth year of his reign. But in the *Jewish War*, which was written for the Romans, it is supposed that the author would follow the Roman method of dating events; according to which, if the death of Herod took place in February 4711, the year after February 4719 would be strictly and exactly the ninth current year of Archelaus's reign.

[3] *Antiq.* lib. xviii. c. 5. [4] Ibid. c. 6. [5] Ibid.

A. D. 33. teacher and guide. The public and the private reason might well exist together: and if Herodias demanded the head of the Baptist from motives of revenge, Herod's own fear of the popularity of the man whom he had already imprisoned, might have induced him to fulfil his promise to Herodias, even if the presence of his lords had not made him ashamed to retract it.

King Agrippa.

This Herodias was sister of Herod Agrippa,[1] whom Caligula made king of the tetrarchy which had belonged to Philip. Upon her brother's elevation to a throne, she used every argument to persuade her husband to seek from the emperor an equal distinction, and in compliance with her wishes he made a voyage to Rome, the object of his journey being not unknown to Agrippa, who entertaining no very friendly views towards him, sent letters beforehand to Caligula charging Herod with secret disaffection, and with holding intercourse with Artabanus the Parthian; in confirmation of which statement he asserted that Herod had made a great collection of military stores. The charge of being thus, though but in appearance, prepared for war, Herod could not deny; and Caligula, persuaded of his having had it in intention to revolt, deprived him of his tetrarchy, and banished him to Lyons. His wife, whose ambition had thus paved the way for her husband's fall, refusing to be separated from him, became the faithful partner of his exile. From Lyons he removed into Spain, where he died.[2]

Banishment and death of Herod Antipas.

A. D. 39.
U. C. 792.

Taxing of Cyrenius.

On the banishment of Archelaus, Judæa was reduced to the condition of a Roman province.[3] The governor of Cœle-Syria, Quirinus, or (as he is called by St. Luke and by Josephus) Cyrenius, came thither in person, attended by Coponius as procurator; and having completed the confiscation of the estate of Archelaus, and the taxing of the people, left the procurator in charge of that portion of his province. Judæa had been for many years as truly a part of the Roman empire as any other conquered country; but the nation did not feel this perfect dependence, until they were compelled to seek justice at the tribunal of a Roman governor, and to pay tribute and taxes directly to Cæsar. The taxing of Cyrenius does not derive its sole importance from the apparent disagreement between St. Luke and Josephus in their account of this transaction;[4] to it may be ascribed the rise of those feelings of hatred against the authority of Cæsar, which originating in religious scruples and increased by various political circumstances, eventually produced the war which terminated in the destruction of Jerusalem. That sect now arose, the sect of Judas Gaulonites, a native of Gamala,[5] and an inhabitant of Galilee, to whose principles and practices Josephus ascribes the ruin of his country. They incul-

Sect of Judas Gaulonites.

[1] *Antiq.* lib. xviii. c. 8. [2] *De Bell. Jud.* lib. ii. c. 9.
[3] *Antiq.* lib. xviii. c. 1. *De Bell. Jud.* lib. ii. c. 8.
[4] For a solution of the difference here stated, see Lardner's *Credibility*, part i. vol. ii. b. ii. c. i.
[5] *Antiq.* lib. xviii. c. 6. *De Bell. Jud.* lib. ii. c. 8.

cated that the Roman Census was a badge of slavery; that it was disgraceful for men who had God for their Lord to pay any tribute, or to own any human master. It is plain that the sect of Judas was a religious faction, and not merely a political party, from its being termed by Josephus the fourth Sect, following those of the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes. We may trace the prevalence of the opinions which they held, in the question put to our Lord respecting the lawfulness of paying tribute to Cæsar, and in the charge made against him of forbidding to give this tribute. That the influence of this party alone produced the rebellion of the Jews is hardly credible; at the same time, we may easily conceive, that an opinion entertained by the common people of the sinfulness of submitting to the Roman authority would aggravate their sense of the injuries committed by the Roman governors, and help to forward the designs of those who from motives of personal aggrandizement fomented the revolt. A. D. 39.

Rise of Christianity.

With the exception of that grand and most important event, the rise and progress of Christianity, the consideration of which belongs to Christian history, and from which we therefore purposely in this place abstain, Judæa, under the Roman procurators, presents few points worthy attention. During the latter years of Augustus, the administration of the country was successively confided to Coponius, Marcus Ambirius, and Annius Rufus: and in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, it is fair to conclude, that under their government the Jews had no reason to lament the change of their political condition. The short duration of their office, and the prospect of being speedily recalled to give an account of their administration, must have tended materially to prevent injustice and oppression; but under the reign of Tiberius, the great length of time during which Valerius Gratus and Pontius Pilate held the office of governor, the one for eleven, the other for ten years, must have given opportunities for maladministration, though it does not appear that Valerius Gratus abused his power. Whilst the Jews in Judæa were enjoying peace under his government, their less fortunate brethren at Rome were by a decree of the senate forbidden the observance of their ceremonies, and commanded either to renounce their religion or to depart from the city. This severe measure was owing to the conduct of four Jews, who were banished from Judæa, and undertook to teach at Rome the doctrines of the Mosaic law. A Roman lady of noble family, who had embraced Judaism, had been induced to commit to their charge offerings of purple and money for the service of the Temple at Jerusalem, which they converted to their own use. Tiberius received information of this fraud, and made it a plea for the expulsion of the Jews; a more genuine motive probably existed in his want of troops; for under sanction of this decree the consuls made a levy of four thousand soldiers from amongst the Jews, and sent them to Sardinia. Many who from religious scruples refused to serve in the army were put to death.

Banishment of the Jews from Rome. A. D. 19.

A. D. 26. Pontius Pilate, Procurator.

Pontius Pilate was the first of the Roman governors whose tyrannical conduct contributed to excite disaffection in Judæa.[1] It had been hitherto the custom for the Roman army, in compliance with the religious feelings of the Jews, to leave outside the city of Jerusalem those ensigns which bore the image of the emperor; but when Pilate sent his troops from Cæsarea to winter at Jerusalem, the standards were secretly introduced under cover of the night. This violation of the sanctity of the holy city excited the indignation of the people, who flocked in crowds to Cæsarea to intreat that the idolatrous emblems might be removed. For six days they continued in vain their supplication to Pilate; on the seventh he surrounded them with soldiers, and threatened them with instant death unless they desisted from their demands. With one accord they declared themselves willing to die; and Pilate, wondering at their courage and patience, found it expedient to comply with their requests, and to give orders for the removal of the standards from Jerusalem. Philo[2] relates a similar circumstance respecting some shields which Pilate had dedicated in the Temple in honour of Tiberius, and which he refused to remove, until an embassy from the Jews had obtained from the emperor an order to that effect.

Pilate seems to have taken pleasure in opposing the prejudices and violating the feelings of the Jewish nation;[3] having expended the sacred treasure of the Temple in building an aqueduct 300 stadia in length, on his return to Jerusalem he was surrounded by the people, who complained aloud of this sacrilege. Pilate foresaw that such complaints would be made, and the means which he took to repress them were consistent with his tyrannical temper. Mixing his troops in private dresses amongst the people, he suddenly gave the signal for an assault. Many were killed by the hands of the soldiers, many more by the pressure of the crowd; terror silenced complaint, and the people fled from the tribunal in dismay.[4] Some tumults of a formidable character having broken out in Samaria, Pilate led his troops to repress them. The Samaritans besought the protection of Vitellius, the proconsul of the province, who inquired into the causes of the disturbance, and being convinced of the misconduct of Pilate, deposed him from his office, and commanded him to appear before the emperor at Rome. Tiberius died before the arrival of Pilate, who thus escaped the punishment due to his crime. But Eusebius[5] relates that Pilate fell into such great troubles under the emperor Caligula, that in despair he committed suicide. It is also stated that he died in banishment at Vienne, in Dauphiny; and a tradition to this effect still exists in that neighbourhood.[6]

His despotism.

ant: death. A. D. 37.

The conduct of the Roman governors was not always oppressive;

[1] *De Bell. Jud.* lib. ii. c. 9. *Antiq.* lib. xviii. c. 5. [2] *Leg. ad Caium.*
[3] *De Bell. Jud.* lib. ii. c. 9. *Antiq.* lib. xviii. c. 4.
[4] *Antiq.* lib. xviii. c. 5. [5] *Hist. Eccles.* lib. ii. c. 7.
[6] Tillemont, *Hist. des Emper.* vol. i. p. 721.

there were found amongst them not unfrequently men, who in the execution of their office united justice with kindness, and who gained a corresponding influence over the affections of the Jewish nation. A. D. 37.

Mildness of Vitellius.

The year prior to Pilate's deposition, Vitellius, the proconsul of Syria, came to Jerusalem; his visit was one of kindness, and he testified his care of the temporal condition, not less than his respect for the religious scruples of the Jews, by relieving them from some vexatious imposts, and restoring to the priests the custody of the robes worn at the festivals by the High-priest,[1] which had been from the time of Herod kept in the castle of Antonia, and came, together with that fortress, into the possession of the Romans. Nor was this the only testimony of regard which Vitellius displayed to the opinions of the nation; for when the army was advancing to a war against Aretas, which was interrupted by the death of Tiberius, he changed the order of march, that the holy territory might not be polluted by the presence of heathen standards, and came himself to sacrifice at Jerusalem.

During the reign of Caligula, Judæa still remained attached to the province of Syria,[2] and the nation began to experience the commencement of those calamities which were prophesied by our Lord as preludes to the destruction of the city and Temple. At this period we observe the rise of that spirit of contention between the Jewish and Greek inhabitants of cities situate in Syria, in Egypt, and in the east, which occasioned the destruction of thousands of the Jews. The Romans generally took part with the Greeks, and by aiding to dispossess the Jews of their ancient privileges, and in some cases permitting the utmost violence to be exercised, they contributed to alienate from themselves the affection of the nation in general.

Contention between Jews and Greeks.

The Alexandrine Jews, by the connivance, and, in some respects, by the open encouragement of Flaccus, the governor,[3] were subjected to a dreadful persecution by the Macedonian inhabitants of Alexandria. For a time the heathen rabble of that great city revelled in the most lawless cruelty. The synagogues of the Jews were polluted by statues of the emperor, their houses plundered, the great body of the Jewish inhabitants forcibly thrust out of the city, and many persons put to death with every kind of torture and insult. These tumults occasioned that embassy to Caligula, in which Philo Judæus bore a chief part; an account of which, as well as of this persecution, which he has recorded, forming, if not the most curious, certainly a very instructive and interesting part of his writings.

Persecution at Alexandria. A. D. 38.

Embassy of Philo Judæus

Insults on account of their religion were not confined to the Alexandrine Jews alone; those of Judæa soon experienced the violence of Caligula, when his flatterers attempted to force compliance with the desires which he had expressed to be honoured as a god. Frequent disputes had taken place in Jamnia,[4] between the Greek and Jewish

Attempt to erect a statue of Caligula in the Temple.

[1] *Antiq.* lib. xviii. c. 5.
[2] Philo, *Leg. ad Caium.* Ibid. *Flaccus.*
[3] Ibid. cc. 9, 10.
[4] Ibid. *Leg. ad Caium.*

A. D. 38. inhabitants; and the impious vanity of Caligula gave the former the fairest opportunity of gratifying their malice. They accordingly erected an altar to the emperor[1] and when the Jews destroyed it, being near to their synagogue, they maliciously informed Caligula of the proceedings, who gave orders to Petronius to erect a still greater abomination, his statue in the Temple at Jerusalem. Well aware of the resistance which the Jewish nation would make to the execution of his decree, he at the same time gave direction to Petronius to reinforce his army, by drawing to his aid one-half the troops stationed upon the Euphrates. Whilst Petronius was at Ptolemais collecting his forces, and waiting the arrival of the statue from Sidon, a body of several thousand Jews came to implore him to desist from the attempt. Alarmed by the determined spirit which they displayed, he went to Tiberias, there to observe the disposition of the people. For forty days together the Jews here continued their supplication, professing their determination to die rather than witness the pollution of the Temple. The Roman general found himself compelled to yield, and promised to write to the emperor in their behalf. Before the arrival of the letter of Petronius, Agrippa had procured, as a personal favour, the reversal of the decree, and despatches had been sent with the announcement. Soon after came the letter of Petronius; the rage of Caligula was unbounded; in his answer he reproached him with corrupt motives in yielding to the Jews, and ordered him
A. D. 41. to put himself to death. But the news of the emperor's decease reached Judæa before the despatch which contained this sentence, and the life of Petronius was thus preserved.

Early history of Agrippa.

On the accession of the emperor Claudius, Judæa was once more, for a period of four years, restored to the dominion of a native prince, in the person of the elder Agrippa.

Agrippa was the grandson of Herod the Great; his father was Aristobulus, the son of Mariamne; his mother Bernice, the daughter of Salome.[2] From his earliest childhood he resided at Rome, under the care of Bernice, where he formed an early friendship with Drusus, the son of Tiberius. As he grew up, his intercourse with the court led him into habits of expense inconsistent with the slender fortune which he enjoyed during his mother's life-time, and upon her death he speedily dissipated his remaining wealth in splendid entertainments,
A. D. 23. and presents conferred to purchase favours at the court. The death of Drusus destroyed his hope of advancement at Rome, and he determined to return to Judæa. Here he married Cypros, the daughter of Phasael, a woman of very superior conduct, and devotedly attached to her husband. For some time he remained in Judæa, but disdaining his dependent station he once more went to Rome to try his fortunes.

Being accompanied by Cypros to Alexandria, by her means he bor-

[1] *Antiq.* lib. xviii. c. 9. *De Bell. Jud.* lib. ii. c. 10.
[2] *Antiq.* lib. xviii. cc. 6, 7. *De Bell. Jud.* lib. ii. c. 9.

rowed a considerable sum, with which he set sail for Italy, whilst his consort returned with her children to Judæa. At Rome, Agrippa once more renewed his intimacy with the family of Tiberius, and became the frequent companion of Caligula; but some words which he one day uttered, expressive of his hope that Caligula might ascend the throne, having been communicated to Tiberius, he was put in prison, and there remained until the death of the emperor released him from his confinement. A. D. 23.

Caligula did not forget the sufferings of his friend. A few days after his accession he sent for him, and placing a diadem upon his head gave him the tetrarchies of Philip and Lysanias, with the title of king, at the same time presenting him with a golden chain equal in weight to the fetters in which he had been bound. Caligula advised him to visit Alexandria on his way to Judæa, and his arrival there occurred during the troubles which the Jewish inhabitants were enduring from their Greek fellow-citizens by the connivance of Flaccus. Agrippa himself was exposed to insult, and undertook on behalf of his afflicted brethren to communicate to Caligula information respecting their condition; his application, however, entirely failed of success. He is invested with the title of king. A. D. 37.

Agrippa did not long remain in Syria after taking possession of his territory, but returned to Rome, and it was at this time that he prevailed upon Caligula to forbear the proposed erection of his statue. When the emperor was assassinated, Agrippa took part in the counsels of the senate, and Claudius was much indebted to him for the peaceable manner in which he came to the throne; and in grateful remembrance of this assistance, he conferred upon Agrippa, in addition to the two tetrarchies received from Caligula, the sovereignty of Judæa and Samaria, and other districts,[1] which together formed a kingdom of equal extent with that of Herod the Great. As a further testimony of his favour, he gave to his brother Herod the kingdom of Chalcis. A. D. 40. Judæa is added to his dominions. A. D. 41.

Agrippa now hastened to Jerusalem, and offering sacrifices of thanksgiving in the Temple, there dedicated the golden fetters which Caligula had given him, as a monument of his former sufferings and a token of the kindness of Providence. The sovereignty of Agrippa was purely dependent upon the court at Rome; but with the Jews his power was supreme; and he so used his authority as to become universally popular, and to gain the character of a wise and beneficent prince. To the Christian Church, however, he was a persecutor, and put James, the brother of John, to death. His motives for this act, and for his attempt on the life of St. Peter, are described by the sacred historian[2] to have been the desire of "pleasing the Jews," a statement quite in unison with the assertion of Josephus respecting the popularity of his government.[3] The splendour of his court, the His popularity

[1] *Antiq.* lib. xix. c. 5. *De Bell. Jud.* lib. ii. c. 11.
[2] *Acts*, c. xii. v. 3. [3] *Antiq.* lib. xix. c. 7, 8.

A. D. 41. liberal presents which he made, his constant residence at Jerusalem, and his exertions to strengthen the city by enclosing the new town, Bezetha, with fortifications, all tended to procure for him the favour of the people. His reign over Judæa lasted little more than three years, though for seven he had enjoyed the title of king over the tetrarchies of Lysanias and Philip. In the account of his death there is that sort of agreement between the Christian and Jewish historian[1] which bespeaks truth in each: they both relate the place, Cæsarea; the time, the celebration of a public solemnity; the adulation of the people in calling him a god; and his allowing such praise to pass unreproved. Josephus writes, that on a sudden he beheld a bird of ill omen, which he recognised as the messenger of evil, and that he was seized with the pains of that disease of which, in five days, he died. The author of the Acts of the Apostles informs us, that immediately the angel of God smote him, "because he gave not God the glory: and he was eaten of worms, and gave up the ghost." Acts xii. 23.

And death.

His children. Agrippa left one son of his own name, a young man of seventeen years of age, and three daughters, Bernice, Mariamne, and Drusilla. With the names of Drusilla and Bernice we are familiar; the one as the companion of Agrippa, when Paul pleaded before Festus; the other as the wife of Felix, the Roman governor. Before her marriage with Felix, Drusilla had been the wife of Azizus, king of Emesa, whom Felix persuaded her to divorce. They had one son, Agrippa, who perished in an eruption of Vesuvius, in the time of the emperor Titus.

His son Agrippa. Claudius would have placed the younger Agrippa upon the throne of Judæa, but was dissuaded from it by his friends. On the death of Herod, king of Chalcis, four years after the death of his father, Agrippa was appointed to succeed him in that kingdom; which, in the twelfth year of Claudius, he exchanged for the tetrarchies of Philip and of Lysanias, a territory which Nero increased by the addition of a part of Galilee.[2]

Fadus, Procurator. On the death of Agrippa the elder, Judæa thus became again a Roman province under the procurator Fadus. The only points in which the authority of the governor was restrained, appear to have been the nomination of the High-priest, the government of the Temple, and the appropriation of the sacred treasure. Herod, king of Chalcis, obtained these privileges by grant from Claudius at the death of his brother. Josephus adds,[3] that this power remained with his descendants from that time until the destruction of the Temple; an assertion in which there appears some slight mistake, since it is more probable that this power should have been continued with the younger Agrippa, and we find, in fact, that he exercised the privilege of deposing the High-priest in the time of Felix and of Festus.[4]

Fadus early rendered himself unpopular by resuming the custody

[1] *Antiq.* lib. xix. c. 8.
[2] *De Bell. Jud.* lib. ii. c. 12.
[3] *Antiq.* lib. xx. c. 1.
[4] Ibid c. 7, ss. 8, 11.

of the High-priest's garments, which Vitellius had restored to the people; but, by the intercession of Agrippa, a decree was obtained from the emperor reversing this proceeding. During the procuratorship of Fadus, and of his successor, Tiberius Alexander, that famine prevailed in Judæa which is related, Acts xi. 28, to have been foretold at Antioch by the Christian prophet Agabus.[1] The public distress gave rise to a very extensive system of plunder. The violence of the robbers was in some measure kept in check by Fadus, but the religious impostors took advantage of this season to draw after them great multitudes.[2] Amongst them was Theudas, who persuaded the people to follow him to the Jordan, pretending that he would enable them to cross it on dry land. Fadus dispersed the assembly by his cavalry, who killed and took many prisoners, and brought the head of Theudas to Jerusalem. The sons of Judas, the Galilean, were seized by Tiberius Alexander and crucified, having probably renewed the endeavours of their father to excite the people to revolt.

A. D. 44–48. Tiberius Alexander, Procurator. Famine. Theudas.

Tiberius Alexander was succeeded in the procuratorship by Cumanus,[3] whose misconduct occasioned much bloodshed. At the feast of the Passover, a Roman soldier having insulted the assembled multitude of worshippers, a tumult arose, which ended in the destruction of 10,000 persons. On another occasion, a servant of the emperor having been robbed, Cumanus sent a party of soldiers to plunder the neighbouring villages, and to bring before him the chief inhabitants. This tyranny they might have endured, had not one of the soldiers added a gross insult to their religion, by tearing in pieces a copy of the Law. The news of this injury spread around, and multitudes of Jews assembled at Cæsarea, to demand the punishment of the soldier from Cumanus, a request which, under the dread of a rising revolt, he was afraid to deny, and the soldier was put to death. A sort of predatory warfare soon afterwards was waged between the Jews and Samaritans, occasioned by some Galileans being murdered by the latter on their way to Jerusalem. Cumanus at first aided the Samaritans, but at length he left the combatants to themselves, and Judæa in consequence became overrun with banditti. The Samaritans at length applied for protection to Quadratus, the governor of the province, who, upon investigating the grounds of their complaint, and understanding that Cumanus was not less blameable than themselves, sent both the procurator and the Samaritans to Rome. Claudius exiled Cumanus, and put the Samaritans to death.[4]

Cumanus, Procurator. A. D. 48. Massacre. A. D. 52. His banishment

The interest of Pallas, the freedman of Claudius, procured for his brother Felix the procuratorship of Judæa. Tacitus states, that both Cumanus and Felix were indifferent to the maintenance of civil order. He adds, that Felix being governor of Samaria whilst Cumanus was governor of Galilee, they encouraged the mutual inroads of the inha-

Felix, Procurator.

[1] *Antiq.* lib. xx. c. 2, 4. [2] Ibid. c. 4.
[3] *De Bell. Jud.* lib. ii. c. 12.
[4] *Antiq.* lib. xx. c. 6. *De Bell. Jud.* lib. ii. c. 13.

A. D. 52. bitants, and themselves shared in the spoil.[1] This account does not agree with that of Josephus, who nowhere mentions the command of Cumanus in Galilee, or of Felix in Samaria. It is scarcely probable that Josephus can have committed any error in his narration, but it is not impossible that Tacitus may have mentioned Galilee as the seat of the government of Cumanus, intending thereby Judæa, and that Felix might have had some subordinate command in Samaria, before he became procurator, which might have escaped the notice of Josephus. There is, however, a particularity in this account of Felix given by Tacitus, which bears the appearance of correct information. He speaks of him as sitting on the day of the trial of Cumanus amongst the judges, being placed there by Quadratus to overawe the accusers; and he adds, that Cumanus alone was condemned for crimes which Felix, as well as Cumanus, had committed. He describes the government of Felix in these powerful expressions, *per omnem sævitiam et libidinem, jus regium servili ingenio exercuit;*[2] a character fully confirmed by the history of his amours, and his employing the *Sicarii* to put the High-priest, Jonathan, to death. The impunity which the *Sicarii* henceforth enjoyed, increased the growth of that dreadful association.[3] The country became infested with robbers, the city was full of assassins, the public mind was perpetually agitated by the appearance of religious impostors and false prophets. Against the robbers Felix directed his force, and kept them in check, having taken Eleazar, their chief. The impostors, and those whom they deceived, he frequently punished. Amongst these was an Egyptian false prophet, who collected a great assembly at the Mount of Olives; the multitude was attacked by Felix, and five hundred persons were killed, but the Egyptian escaped; a circumstance which illustrates the question of the Roman captain to St. Paul, "Art not thou that Egyptian," &c. (Acts xxi. 38.) The *Sicarii* alone remained uncontrolled; murders were perpetrated in open day by these men, who, mixing with the crowd unperceived, aimed the fatal blow at their victim. Felix had availed himself of their services, and they requited his protection by exciting the people to revolt, and by attacking the houses, and burning the villages of those who did not yield to their views. The spirit of cruelty which thus pervaded the country, at length corrupted the ministers of religion. The higher sacerdotal orders, forming themselves into a party, seized the tithes throughout the country, and left the poorer priests, with their wives and families, to perish from want.

Miseries of Judæa.

A. D. 60. Festus, Procurator.

Such was the condition of Judæa when Festus became procurator; his government lasted two years, and on his death he was succeeded by Albinus.[4] At his first entrance upon the duties of his charge, Albinus employed his whole care to the restoration of public order, and put

A. D. 62. Albinus, Procurator.

[1] *Annal.* lib. xii. c. 54. Tillemont, *Hist. des Emper.* vol. i. p. 806, 1075.
[2] *Hist.* lib. v. c. 10. [3] *Antiq.* lib. xx. c. 7.
[4] *Antiq.* lib. xx. c. 8. *De Bell. Jud.* lib. ii. c. 14.

many *Sicarii* to death; but in the end he became careless and oppressive; justice was bought and sold; crimes were suffered to go unpunished; taxes were heaped upon the people; the formation of parties, and the establishment of petty tyrannies, was universally allowed. Much of the misconduct of Albinus is to be attributed to the influence which Ananias, the High-priest, gained over him; and the increase of disorder was materially owing to the surrender of some captive *Sicarii*, at the suggestion of Ananias, in exchange for the scribe of Eleazar, whom others of their party had carried off by night. Henceforward the confidence of these banditti was unbounded; for they had learned that by capturing the friends of Ananias, and detaining them as hostages, they might secure the release of any of their own associates. A. D. 62. Abuses of the High-priest, Ananias.

The misconduct of Albinus was in some degree concealed, if not sanctioned, by the Jewish chiefs, who availed themselves of his authority to establish tyrannies each within his own sphere.[1] Nevertheless, contrasted with Florus, who succeeded him, Albinus appears to have been just and merciful. The new procurator acted like an executioner, sent to enforce the sentence of condemnation upon the whole Jewish nation. Cruel, and regardless even of the semblance of equity and truth, he did not confine his tyranny to the oppression of individuals, but he amassed wealth by the destruction of multitudes, and the spoil of whole cities. Every robber might plunder at will if Florus shared the booty. Extensive districts were reduced to the solitude of a desert; and men left Judæa to seek in distant countries that protection which was denied to them at home. At the Passover, A.D. 66, Cestius Gallus, the governor of Syria, coming to Jerusalem, was there made acquainted with the tyranny of Florus, by the multitude who besought his protection. Cestius answered them with fair promises, but did nothing; and returning to Antioch, was accompanied on his way thither by Florus. Florus still continued the same line of conduct, in the hope, as Josephus states, that in the breaking out of a rebellion, his own crimes might pass unpunished. Florus, Procurator. His oppressions. A. D. 66.

Tacitus, in speaking of the conduct of the Roman governors from the time of Felix, says, *Duravit patientia Judæis usque ad Gessium Florum Procuratorem. Sub eo bellum ortum;*[2] an honourable testimony in favour of the nation, which requires some qualification; for it is impossible to read the History of Josephus without discerning, that the misgovernment of the Romans was not the only trial of the patience of the nation. What they had to endure at the hands of the governors, was in itself nothing when compared with those greater evils, which were inflicted by the general demoralization of society, the entire absence of all justice, the murders of the *Sicarii*, and the tyranny of the higher orders. In a state of anarchy, such as we have described, it is not surprising that a rebellion should have commenced upon comparatively slight grounds, and without any definite object in

[1] *Antiq.* lib. xx. c. 18. *De Bell. Jud.* lib. ii. c. 14. [2] *Hist.* lib. v. c. 9.

A. D. 66. The Jewish war commenced in tumults at Cæsarea.

view. The Jewish historian dates the breaking out of the war from some tumults which took place at Cæsarea, in the month Artemisium, (May,) of the year A. D. 66, the twelfth of Nero's, and the seventeenth of Agrippa's reign. These disturbances were occasioned by the arrival of the final decree of Nero, upon an appeal which had been made to him by the Greek and Jewish inhabitants respecting the rights of citizenship. The rejection of the claims of the Jews was the signal for tumult.[1] In the contest between the two parties at Cæsarea, the Jews were the aggressors, and Florus interposed to preserve order; but the Jews, as they believed, purchased his protection by a present of eight talents. The tumult increasing, the Jews began to entertain serious apprehensions for their safety, and retired with the books of their Law to Narbata, a place which belonged to them, about sixty stadia distant from Cæsarea. Florus had retired to Sebaste, having left the Jews and Greeks to decide their own quarrel: but when he was reminded by the Jews who came thither, that they had good reason to demand his protection in return for the money which he had received; he construed their removal from Cæsarea to Narbata into an act of rebellion, and put their ambassadors into prison. The inhabitants of Jerusalem beheld this tyranny with indignation; but they remained quiet, until Florus, anxious, as it might seem, to compel them to give vent to their feelings, sent his officers to take seventeen talents from the sacred Treasury, pretending that they were required for the service of Cæsar. The multitude on this occasion insulted Florus, by carrying round a bag, and pretending to beg alms for their poor and distressed governor; an insult which he pretended to consider of more consequence than the tumults which he still suffered to continue at Cæsarea, and therefore brought all his force to Jerusalem to demand satisfaction. The chief Jews tried to

Severities of Florus at Jerusalem.

appease his anger, but he refused to be satisfied, and ordered his soldiers to plunder the upper market-place, and to put to death those who resisted. The soldiers ravaged the whole city, and no less than 3,600 persons, of every age and sex, perished on this occasion. To complete the measure of his tyranny, he violated all the laws and privileges of Rome itself, by scourging and crucifying Jews, who had been admitted to the Roman order of knights.[2] Bernice, the sister of Agrippa, entreated Florus to spare the people from the violence of the soldiers, whose attack she herself only escaped by flying for refuge to the palace; but he turned a deaf ear to her remonstrance and prayers. The priests, alarmed at the prospect of rebellion, endeavoured to persuade the people to submission; but the sedition was too far gone to be repressed, and when it was evidently the intention of Florus to plunder the Temple, the people perceiving his purpose broke down the porticoes which connected it with the castle of Antonia.

Florus thus foiled in his purpose, left one cohort in Jerusalem to

[1] *De Bell. Jud.* lib. ii. c. 14. [2] Ibid. c. 15.

assist the priests in maintaining order, and returned to Cæsarea. A. D. 66.
Cestius Gallus, the governor of Syria, being informed of these disturbances, despatched one of his generals, Neapolitanus, in company with Agrippa, to Jerusalem, to ascertain the real state of affairs. Here Agrippa remained after the departure of Neapolitanus, and exerted all his influence to put a stop to the rebellion. Florus was not without some pretext for seizing the sacred treasure; for when Agrippa reminded the people of their refusal to pay the tribute which was due, and amounted to forty talents, and of their violent conduct in pulling down the porticoes, they instantly began to repair the damage and to collect the tribute for payment. Thus far Agrippa succeeded; but when he began to recommend submission to Florus until another governor should be appointed, the flame of sedition which had been smothered burst forth in an attack of the populace upon himself, and compelled his hasty abandonment of the city.

Conciliatory measures of Agrippa.

He quits Jerusalem.

The sedition now began to display a more decided character. The occupation of the castle Masada, and the destruction of the Roman garrison, together with the refusal to offer any more sacrifices in the Temple in behalf of the Romans, amounted to an open declaration of war.[1] In this latter proceeding they adopted the advice of Eleazar, the son of Ananus the High-priest, a young man of bold and daring temper, who became the first leader of the rebellion. These transactions were, however, in accordance with the feelings of but one party in the city. The nobles applied to Florus and Agrippa for aid; the former purposely took no notice of their request, but Agrippa aided them with a force of 3,000 men. The party which sought for peace was in possession of the Upper City: the Lower City and Temple were entirely in the hands of the rebels, who by continued attacks upon the king's troops, endeavoured to weary out their patience, and to force them to retire; until at length, in the month of August, they succeeded in taking the castle of Antonia, and put the garrison to death. A new chief arose to give fresh vigour to the siege of the Upper City, in the person of Manahem the son of Judas the Galilean; and by his assistance, the king's troops were forced to surrender, whilst the Romans shut themselves up in the three towers, Phasael, Herod, and Mariamne. The pride and cruelty of Manahem became soon insupportable, and both he and his friends were put to death, the people willingly assisting Eleazar to remove his rival. The Roman garrison soon surrendered to Eleazar, under a solemn promise of safety; a promise which he impiously violated, profaning the sabbath-day by putting all his prisoners to death, with the exception of Metilius their commander, who saved his life by consenting to be circumcised. The blood of these Romans was providentially revenged upon the Jewish nation, by a massacre of 20,000 Jews at Cæsarea,[2] which took place on the very same day and hour on which this crime was perpetrated at Jerusalem. Not one Jew remained in that city, the few that escaped the slaughter

Rise of Eleazar,

and Manahem.

Massacre at Cæsarea.

[1] *De Bell. Jud.* lib. ii. c. 17.

[2] Ibid. c. 18.

A. D. 66. being sent by Florus to serve in the galleys. This enormity drove the whole nation into a state of desperation; they rushed forth upon the neighbouring Syrian cities with fire and sword; and the Syrians in return avenged the inroad by putting to death not only every one that was outwardly a Jew, but all whom they suspected of being Jews in affection. Antioch, Sidon, and Apamea, were the only cities wherein anarchy and plunder did not prevail. As at Antioch so perhaps at Sidon and Apamea, the number of Christian converts might have proved, under Providence, a defence from this dreadful storm. The vengeance thus inflicted on the nation, extended also to Alexandria, where 50,000 Jews were put to death at this time by the Roman soldiers.

Massacre at Alexandria.

Cestius advances to Jerusalem.

A short time before the Feast of Tabernacles, Cestius collected his troops, in number about 20,000, and having first delivered Galilee from the inroads of the rebels, advanced from Cæsarea towards Jerusalem, and encamped at Gabao, fifty stadia distant from Jerusalem. A vigorous assault upon the city would have at once put an end to the war; but Florus bribed the officers of Cestius to encourage delay, and give the Jews time to prepare for resistance. The same secret influence occasioned Cestius to break up the siege, which he had prosperously begun, and to commence his retreat from Jerusalem at the very time when the seditious despaired of further resistance. In the pass at Bethoron the intervention of night alone preserved the Roman army from being destroyed by the Jews, who pursued them with unceasing alacrity; Cestius reached Antipatris, having lost 5,000 men, with all his stores, in the retreat; whilst the rebels returned in triumph to Jerusalem, having experienced very little loss. This defeat took

Success of the Jews.

A. D. 66. place on the 18th of the month Dius (November). Many of the chief Jews availed themselves of this opportunity to retire from the city; and it is probable, that at this time the Christians withdrew to Pella, a city beyond the Jordan. The traditionary account preserved by Eusebius[1] places this event at a period prior to the war; that is, probably, prior to the campaigns of Vespasianus, which terminated in the destruction of the city.

Preparations for regular war.

On the defeat of Cestius,[2] the Jews commenced their first regular preparations for war. The city was committed to the care of Joseph, the son of Gorion, and Ananus the High-priest. Idumæa and Peræa, with other districts and cities, were given in charge to various leaders. Josephus, the historian, was invested with the government of the whole of Galilee; and has left us very full particulars of his own conduct, of his care in the administration of justice, in fortifying the cities, and organizing an army for the defence of the country; and making every allowance for the personal vanity of the historian, he appears to have been admirably suited to the office thus intrusted to him.

The despatches from Cestius, which announced his defeat, and

[1] *Hist. Eccles.* lib. iii. c. 5. [2] *De Bell. Jud.* lib. ii. c. 20.

attributed the whole misfortune to Florus, reached the Emperor Nero in Achaia,[1] who without delay appointed Vespasianus to conduct the war in Judæa. Vespasianus proceeded to Antioch, where he found Agrippa waiting his arrival, whilst his son Titus went to Alexandria, and thence brought two legions to reinforce the army of the province. The army assembled during the winter at Ptolemais, and consisted of more than four Roman legions, which with the auxiliaries furnished by Agrippa and other native princes, amounted together to above 60,000 men.

A. D. 66.

Vespasianus appointed to conduct the war.

A. D. 67.

In the spring of A. D. 67, Vespasianus commenced his operations,[2] and occupied the remainder of the year in the reduction of Galilee. The chief feature of the campaign was the siege of Jotapata, which Josephus defended for forty-seven days, and in which 40,000 persons perished. Josephus being taken prisoner, was treated with respect, and by degrees contrived to ingratiate himself with Vespasianus and Titus. 30,000 of the inhabitants of Tarichea, a city taken in the autumn by Titus, were sold as slaves. Giscala, amongst other places was also taken, a city which gave name to John of Giscala,[3] who escaping from the siege took refuge in Jerusalem, and was preserved to be one of the chief scourges by which Providence inflicted vengeance upon that devoted city.

Josephus is taken prisoner.

John of Giscala.

The success of the Romans threw every city in Judæa into contending factions;[4] each family was divided, as its members advocated peace or war. Universal discord reigned. Robberies increased; the whole country was pillaged; and the devastation thus produced could not have been exceeded even by the invasion of the Roman army. In Jerusalem, John of Giscala was most conspicuous in urging resistance to the Romans, and proclaiming that the city was impregnable. The robbers, who had hitherto wasted the country, gradually introduced themselves into Jerusalem; and being received by the people as allies, at length assumed the mastery, putting to death those who opposed them, appointing High-priests, and exercising the most absolute tyranny. The people rose against them, and had nearly subdued these Zealots (for so the robbers now called themselves, pretending the most perfect devotion to the cause of religion), when the treachery of John of Giscala turned the scale in their favour.[5] Having undertaken to negotiate a surrender of those who kept possession of the Temple, instead of forwarding the purport of his mission, he took the opportunity of intimating to them that assistance might be procured from Idumæa. The Idumæans were accordingly informed that the party under Ananus, and the priests who were opposed to the Zealots, were meditating the surrender of the city to the Romans, upon which they instantly assembled to the number of 20,000 men, and came with all speed to Jerusalem. Ananus closed the gates; but during the night the Zealots, under the cover which a violent storm afforded,

His influence in Jerusalem.

[1] *De Bell. Jud.* lib. iii. c. 1. [2] Ibid. c. 6, 7.
[3] Ibid. lib. iv. c. 2. [4] Ibid. c. 3. [5] Ibid.

A. D. 67. came forth from the Temple and admitted the Idumæans. The
Murder of the nobles. guards of Ananus, to the number of 8,000, were put to death. Ananus and 12,000 of the nobles were afterwards taken and slain. The Idumæans were soon undeceived,[1] and convinced how fallacious was the charge of treachery, which had induced them to commit these cruelties, and becoming ashamed of their conduct, they returned home; whilst the Zealots, now left to themselves, ceased not the work of destruction, killing every man of rank or property, and allowing poverty alone to be a defence from injury.

A. D. 68. Such was the state of affairs in Jerusalem at the commencement of the following year, A.D. 68, the Zealots being divided into two parties (one of them headed by John of Giscala), were united in no other purpose but that of plunder. Vespasianus still delayed the commencement of the siege; a line of conduct which increased the sufferings of the Jews, by lengthening the period of the tyranny which they endured under the dominion of the Zealots. The Roman army was employed in subduing Peræa, and had nearly gained possession of the whole surrounding country, when intelligence arriving of the death of Nero,[2]
Pause in the campaign. the war was immediately suspended. A gracious interval of repentance was thus allowed to the nation, an interval of which they took no account, but by their crimes heaped still greater vengeance upon themselves.

Simon, son of Gioras. Simon, the son of Gioras, appeared at this time as a leader of banditti. Idumæa was the chief scene of his plunder; but his whole purpose was the possession of Jerusalem. Wherever he led his followers, he left behind him a desolation like that of the locust. Surrounded by havoc and slaughter, he happened to approach the gates of Jerusalem at a time when the rapine and insatiable lust of the soldiers of John of Giscala, had prepared the people to look for protection to any power which might prove stronger than that possessed by the Zealots; whilst the disputes which had arisen between the Idumæan and the other Zealots, having induced the former to combine with the people, there was little difficulty in admitting
A. D. 69. Simon into the city. Simon was received with acclamations as a deliverer, and in the month of Xanthicus (March) of the year 69, became master of Jerusalem.

Vespasianus proclaimed emperor. In July, Vespasianus was proclaimed emperor at Alexandria, and before the fifteenth of that month the whole of Syria had invested him with the Imperial purple; whereupon going to Rome, he left Titus to pursue the war in Judæa. During this year the Roman army remained inactive; but a war, more dreadful than any which the Romans could have waged, was carried on within the city. Eleazar, the son of Ananus, who had obtained considerable influence amongst the Zealots[3] previous to the arrival of John of Giscala, unwilling any longer to submit to his authority, conspired with his friends, and took possession of the inner court of the Temple. Three parties

[1] *De Bell. Jud.* lib. iv. c. 5. [2] Ibid. c. 9. [3] Ibid. lib. v. c. 1.

within its walls disputed the possession of Jerusalem. Eleazar, with a garrison of 2,500 followers, held the Temple; the Upper City was the station of Simon's force, which amounted to 15,000 men; in the Lower City John of Giscala kept his post with 6,000 Zealots. Between these factions an unceasing warfare was waged; every place, whether within or without the Temple, was polluted with blood. The people alternately a prey to each, could hardly refrain from praying earnestly for the arrival of the Romans. In the midst of the horrors which prevailed, the private charities of life lost all their influence: death was so common an event, that no man took pains to bury the body of his dearest friend; as not knowing whether himself should survive the succeeding hour. The sacrifices of the Temple were however continued; and the leaders of the factions still promised protection to those Jews and foreigners who brought victims to be offered to the Most High; but those who trusted to this promise, as well as the priests themselves, were often killed by stones and weapons, hurled into the Temple from the Upper City, and mingled their blood with that of the victim upon the altar.

A. D. 69. Three factions within the city.

Early in the spring, Titus came from Alexandria to Cæsarea, and a short time before the Passover, his army, which consisted of about 60,000 men from different points, directed its march towards Jerusalem. Josephus, the historian, and Tiberius Alexander, a former governor of Egypt, were in attendance upon Titus.[1] The line of march passed through Samaria to Gibeah of Saul, a place distant thirty stadia from Jerusalem; the army here encamped, whilst Titus went forward with 600 horse to take a view of the city, to which he advanced so near as narrowly to escape from an ambush which the Jews had laid. On the following day the army encamped at Scopus, a place seven stadia distant, on a plain rising towards the north, from which there was a view of the whole extent of the Temple and city. Two legions took post at Scopus itself; a third, three stadia in the rear; the fourth, which advanced from Jericho, was stationed on the Mount of Olives, which lies on the east of Jerusalem, and is separated from it by the deep valley of Cedron. The city was at this time crowded with inhabitants, who had assembled from all parts to celebrate the Passover; the whole nation being thus collected as within a prison, to undergo the Divine judgment.

Titus commences the siege of Jerusalem. A. D. 70.

The large assembly of the Jews which thronged to the feast from so many distant and different countries, might give rise to the belief expressed by Dion Cassius (lib. lxvi.), that the rebels received reinforcements from the parts beyond the Euphrates; and that many kings of the Barbarians sent troops to defend the city. It was certainly one of the charges brought by Titus against them to justify his attack, that they had sent embassies to their brethren beyond the Euphrates to demand assistance.[2]

Josephus has given a very detailed description of Jerusalem and of

[1] *De Bell. Jud.* lib. v. c. 11. [2] Ibid. lib. vi. c. 6. s. 2.

A. D. 70. Description of the fortifications.

its fortifications; at the same time we must lament, that neither the measurements nor the bearings of the different places are sufficiently detailed to enable us to lay down with certainty any plan of the city. The north appears to have been the part most on a level with the surrounding country, and on that side Titus carried on the siege as Pompey had done before him. In circuit the walls of the city extended thirty-three stadia, and towards the north-west presented a triple line of fortification. Upon the outer wall, which was added by Agrippa to protect the new city, called Bezetha, there stood ninety towers; the whole height of the wall being twenty-five cubits; the middle wall had fourteen towers, the interior and most ancient sixty; on the outer wall at the north-west angle stood the tower Psephina, seventy cubits high, and of an octagonal form; and opposite to it in the inner wall, the three splendid towers built by Herod, called Hippicus, Phasael, and Mariamne. Jerusalem was a place both by nature and art of no ordinary strength. In the spot which Titus selected for his first attack, the outer wall was somewhat lower than elsewhere;[1] and that part of the city being but thinly inhabited, they had neglected to form a junction between the first and second wall, so that no obstacle presented itself to the subsequent attack of the third and inner wall. The Jews were well prepared to meet their enemies, by their obstinate resolution, by the despair of safety, and by that bigoted attachment to their Temple and country, in the ruin of which they would rather perish than survive; and although throughout the siege a party existed within the city desirous to submit to the Romans, yet in the time of actual contest not one was found to act the part of a traitor.

Struggles of the Jewish factions.

The factions of Eleazar and John of Giscala had now united, and occupied the Temple, which they had obtained by stratagem, and the Lower City. Simon had the command in the Upper City. For some time after the actual commencement of the siege, the combats between these two factions still continued; nor was it until the battering rams of Titus were brought to bear upon the outer wall, that the nearness of the danger united them against the common enemy. The Jews defended the outer walls for fifteen days, being successful in an early sally, and having partially burned the works of their besiegers; but on the 7th of Artemisium (May) they withdrew, leaving to the Romans possession of the northern part of the city.[2] Titus pitched his tent within the wall, in a place called the Assyrian Camp, and renewed the siege by an attack upon the second wall; in five days more he won this also, and occupied the included portion of the city with 1,000 men;[3] neither the houses were burned, nor were any prisoners put to death, for he still hoped by a show of clemency to induce a surrender. The besieged interpreted this conduct as if he despaired of taking the city by force; so that the merciful behaviour of the Romans only increased the obstinacy of the resistance opposed

The two outer walls captured.

[1] *De Bell. Jud.* bid. lib. v. c. 6. [2] Ibid. c. 7. [3] Ibid. c. 8.

to them. A second sally drove the besiegers for three days from their last acquired post; but on the fourth the Jews were finally repulsed, and compelled to remain within the inner wall.[1] During the five following days all active operations were discontinued, while the army was furnished with fresh supplies, and Titus reviewed his troops in the sight of the besieged: the splendour of their equipment, and the discipline and order which the Roman forces displayed, threw a consternation over the leaders of the sedition: but they knew that they had gone too far to be allowed to purchase safety for themselves by submission; and death in war was preferable either to captivity or to the sword of the executioner. Thus, as Josephus observes, was the will of Providence fulfilled, that together with the leaders of the faction the whole State should perish. A. D. 70.

Still anxious to preserve the city, Titus sent Josephus to address the Jews upon the wall, and persuade them to desist from a hopeless defence: his arguments had no effect upon the chiefs of the sedition, but many of the common people were induced to desert to the Romans, being kindly received by them, and permitted to pass whithersoever they desired. Against these deserters, John and Simon kept strict watch, and put to death all whom they suspected.[2] Famine with all its horrors now began to appear, and with it the fury of the factions proportionally increased. When corn ceased to be openly sold, the robbers searched private houses: if they were disappointed in finding food, the inhabitants were tortured on suspicion of having it concealed; if food was found they were punished for having kept it privately to themselves. For a measure of wheat the rich man sold valuable possessions; for a handful of barley the poor man parted with all that yet remained to him. Families hid themselves while they partook their scanty meal, in hopes to eat it undisturbed by robbers; the table was no longer set, but each man snatched from the hearth his half-baked cakes, or devoured in silence unground and undressed corn.[3] Every moral feeling was extinct; the wife admitted not her husband to share her food; the son suffered his father to perish; mothers snatched the bread from their children's lips. Some wandered out at night to collect herbs, who on their return were robbed of what they had gained at the peril of their lives. Such were the sufferings of the poor, whilst the rich were taken before Simon and John, and plundered and put to death. These chiefs, still at discord with each other, were in union only in committing crimes.[4] Mission of Josephus. Famine.

The number of persons who now deserted was so considerable, that Titus gave orders that they should be considered prisoners, and crucified in sight of the city; by this severity hoping to hasten the surrender. No less than five hundred were taken in a single day; the crucifixions continued until wood was wanting for the instruments of punishment, and no space was left whereon to erect them. The Crucifixion of deserters.

[1] *De Bell. Jud.* lib. v. c. 9.
[2] Ibid. c. 10.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Ibid. c. 11.

A. D. 70. Roman soldiers made sport of this cruelty, by hanging up their victims in grotesque postures; and thus, unknowingly, requited upon the nation their cruel derision of our Lord's sufferings. Titus finding that this course of severity was ineffectual, contented himself with striking off the hands of the deserters and sending them back.

At the end of seventeen days, between the 12th and 29th of Artemisium (May), the Roman army had completed four batteries. Those erected against Antonia was speedily overthrown by the mines which Simon had constructed; for the besieged had learned by experience to practise every art of defence. The remaining works were also destroyed by fire in a sally, and it was not without difficulty that the Romans repelled the fierceness of this attack, and drove the Jews once more within. It was evident that the defence would be protracted to the last extremity;[1] in order therefore to prevent escape, and to hasten the inroads of famine, by cutting off every supply of provision from without, Titus commenced the stupendous work of carrying a line of circumvallation around the entire city. Three days' labour, and the united exertions of every officer and man in the whole Roman army sufficed for the completion of a mound thirty-nine stadia in length, and the erection at intervals of thirteen forts or redoubts, which measured in circuit ten additional stadia. The famine now raged with the utmost fury, and death in its most terrible shapes wasted the wretched population. At first the corpses were buried at the public charge, but the numbers increased so much, that eventually they were thrown over the walls into the deep hollows which surrounded the city. When Titus beheld this fearful sight, he lifted up his hands to heaven, and called God to witness that he was not the guilty author of such dreadful deeds. The number of dead bodies carried out at one single gate amounted to 110,000;[2] and it was calculated that altogether not less than 600,000 of the lower orders were thus disposed of, besides those richer persons who were buried in the city in private houses.[3] Many still escaped from the city, but the greater part of these died miserably; some from intemperate eating, others by the hands of the soldiers, who ripped up the captives in search for the gold and precious stones which they were believed to have swallowed. In this way 2000 perished in a single night; and in defiance of the prohibition of Titus this cruelty continued to be practised, chiefly by the Arabian and Syrian auxiliaries. It was during this period of horror that an abomination was perpetrated, so repugnant to the strongest feelings of our nature, that were it not for the indisputable evidence of Josephus, who had ample opportunities of knowing the fact, and no temptation to falsify it, we should reject it altogether as a fable.[4] A mother deliberately destroyed her infant child, and having prepared it as food, offered it to the robbers who were attracted by its savour. Her name was Mary the daughter of Eleazar.

Titus draws a line of circumvallation round the city.

[1] *De Bell. Jud.* lib. v. c. 12.
[2] Ibid. c. 13.
[3] Ibid. c. 12.
[4] Ibid. lib. vi. c. 3.

The leaders of the sedition supplied their followers by the plunder of the people.[1] To cruelty, John now added the guilt of sacrilege, melting down the vessels of gold which were used in the service of the Temple, and distributing the wine and oil which the priests had religiously preserved for the purposes of sacrifice. In July, Titus reduced the castle of Antonia. The works which were brought to bear upon it occupied no less than three weeks in their construction; a task of no inconsiderable difficulty, since no timber for that purpose was found within the distance of twelve miles. The famine was so severe, that at last the daily sacrifice ceased;[2] and Titus wisely considering that this must be a favourable opportunity for negotiation, gave orders to Josephus to make the attempt, but with no better success than heretofore. At this period many of the nobles, and the high-priests, Joseph and Jesus, contrived to escape; Titus received them kindly, and upon a circulation of a report within the city that those persons had perished, he showed them to the people on the wall, as an assurance of the safety which they might yet enjoy. A. D. 70. Reduction of the castle of Antonia.

In an assault upon the Temple, from which he was repulsed, Titus succeeded in destroying some part of its porticoes, the remainder were thrown down by the Jews themselves. On the 8th day of Lois (August), Titus finding that the labour of the battering rams for six days incessantly had produced no impression upon the walls of the Temple, and wearied with the obstinate resistance of the besieged, determined to set fire to the gates. For a day and night the work of destruction was thus continued,[3] when orders were given to the soldiers to extinguish the flames, and to prepare a way for the assault. A severe contest took place between the contending parties, which at last terminated in the Jews being driven into the inner Temple, and leaving the outer court in possession of the Romans. The preservation of the Temple was most anxiously desired by Titus; and every possible exertion was made by the troops to extinguish the fires which were still burning. Whilst thus employed they were again attacked by a sally of the besieged. Amid the confusion, a soldier seized a brand, and throwing it in at an open window, set fire to one of the chambers. Titus was alarmed by the cry which the Jews within raised when they beheld the flames, and advanced with the great body of his troops; his most urgent commands were to extinguish the flames, but the soldiers, furious with the prospect of victory, pretending to misunderstand the orders, and excited each other to extend the fire. A dreadful scene of slaughter ensued, chiefly of multitudes of unarmed persons who had fled for refuge to the inner court and altar, confiding in the predictions of numerous false prophets, who were suborned by the leaders of the sedition to assure them of the certainty of a miraculous deliverance. The flames had penetrated only to the exterior chambers; and Titus, accompanied by his generals, entered into the Holy place, and there beheld all the glory of this far-famed The Temple set on fire, and destroyed.

[1] *De Bell. Jud.* lib. v. c. 13. [2] Ibid. lib. vi. c. 2. [3] Ibid. c. 4.

A. D. 70. House of God. The sight only served to increase his regret at the destruction which was raging; and he again endeavoured to enforce his orders, but in vain. The soldiers wilfully disobeyed, and Titus and his officers were compelled to quit the building. By a remarkable coincidence, it happened that this conflagration of the Temple took place on the 15th day of Lois, the same day and month in which the Temple of Solomon had been burnt by Nebuchadnezzar. Josephus dates the burning of the Temple by Titus in the second year of Vespasianus, 1130 years, 7 months, and 15 days after its foundation by Solomon; and 539 years, 45 days, after the foundation by Haggai, in the second year of the reign of Cyrus.[1]

Prodigies related by Josephus.

Josephus has related many prodigies (the occurrence of which it is plain that he himself believed) foretelling the destruction of the city. For a whole year a comet, resembling in shape a sword, stood over the city. Before the war broke out, on the eighth day of Xanthicus, at the Feast of Unleavened Bread, at the ninth hour of the night, a light as bright as that of day shone round the altar. A heifer led to be sacrificed brought forth a lamb in the Temple. The eastern gate, which required twenty men to close it, was seen to open of its own accord at the sixth hour of the night. A few days after that festival, before sunset, chariots and troops in armour were seen carried in the clouds; and at the Feast of Pentecost, at night, a voice was heard in the Temple, saying, "Let us remove hence." Four years before the war, during the Feast of Tabernacles, Jesus, the son of Ananus, began to cry in the Temple, "A voice from the east; a voice from the west; a voice from the four winds; a voice against Jerusalem and the Temple; a voice against the bridegrooms and the brides; a voice against the whole people!" He was scourged by the magistrates; but at every stripe he uttered, "Woe to Jerusalem!" For seven years and five months he continued the same mournful cry; at length during the siege he went upon the wall, and there crying with the loudest voice, "Woe, woe once more to the city, to the Temple, and to the people!" he added, "Woe, woe to myself also!" at which instant he was killed by a stone from one of the Roman engines.

Defence of the Upper City.

The siege of Jerusalem did not terminate with the destruction of the Temple. The terms which Titus again offered to Simon and John were again refused. For themselves they had no expectation of mercy from the Romans, and they trusted at the last to effect their escape by the subterraneous passages within the city. The besiegers soon took the Lower City, which fell a prey to the flames; but the Upper City and Palace required to be regularly besieged. On the 20th day of Lois (August)[2] the works were begun, and they were finished in eighteen days. The Idumæans had made an offer to surrender to Titus, and sent five of their officers for that purpose; but their design being discovered, Simon put their chiefs to death, and doubled the vigilance of the guards to prevent the escape of so large a body: the

[1] *De Bell. Jud.* lib. vi. c. 5 [2] Ibid. c. 8.

multitude, though deprived of their leaders, still retained their purpose, and with some loss deserted to Titus. Great numbers of the captives were sold at a cheap rate, and 40,000 were reserved for Cæsar, who suffered them to depart as they pleased. On the 7th day of Gorpiæus (September), the battering-rams were brought against the walls; but the attack was no longer repulsed with the same vigour as before; and the leaders of the sedition beholding themselves now deserted by all who had before proved faithful, began to fear the result. With little difficulty the Romans found themselves masters of the walls: the people fled to Acra; and the tyrants by a strange infatuation, instead of throwing themselves into the impregnable fortresses, formed by the three towers Hippicus, Phasael, and Mariamne, escaped to the subterraneous passages. The slaughter of the multitude continued till evening, until the soldiers were weary of killing. Titus had given orders that none should be put to death, but such as were found in arms; but the soldiers spared only those who were fit to be sold as captives. At night the city was set on fire, and the next day still beheld Jerusalem enveloped in flames. Those who survived this work of devastation were collected in the ruined circuit of the Temple, and divided into lots at the will of their conquerors; some were sent to work in the mines of Egypt, others were condemned to be exhibited as gladiators in the cities of the Empire; and happy were the 11,000 who perished in the Temple from want of food, whilst this dreadful sentence was passing upon their less fortunate countrymen. Hunger at last compelled John of Giscala, together with his friends, to leave their secret hiding-places, and surrender themselves to Titus. He was condemned to perpetual imprisonment. Simon had retired with his most faithful followers to a cavern, in which provisions had been collected, and where they hoped by mining to be able to find an opening into the country, and thus escape; but their progress was tardy, and the provisions began to fail. When Simon saw no hope of escape, he dressed himself in a white tunic and a purple robe, and suddenly presented himself in the midst of the ruins of the Temple. The Roman soldiers were astonished at this strange appearance; Simon beckoned them to approach him, and desired them to call Terentius Rufus, the governor, to whom he surrendered himself. Being reserved by Titus to grace his Triumph at Rome, he was on that occasion put to death.

A. D. 70.

It is stormed and captured

After the capture of Jerusalem, the three forts of Herodium, Machærus, and Masada, still remained in the possession of the Jewish rebels, and Titus left the reduction of them to his generals. Before he finally quitted Syria, he returned to Jerusalem to survey the ruins; amongst which great treasures still continued to repay the labour of the Roman troops in making excavations. The sight of such devastation, contrasted with the remembrance of the ancient splendour of the city, deprived Titus of all the gratification which so great a victory might otherwise have conferred: the fame of conquest obtained by the

A. D. 70. infliction of such misery, could not be a subject of exultation to a man who had any compassion for the sufferings of mankind. The whole city and Temple was levelled to the ground, with the exception of the three towers, which were left standing as a monument of its former greatness, and a part of the western wall, which served to protect the garrison; but even these scanty relics had perished in the time of Hadrian; thus fulfilling that remarkable prophecy of our blessed Lord, "that not one stone should be left upon another." The whole number of Jews who perished in Judæa, and in the neighbouring countries during this war, is estimated at one million and a half.

The city levelled to the ground.